SEVEN WORDS IN BHARATA
WHAT DO THEY SIGNIFY

K. M. VARMA

5/5=

SEVEN WORDS IN BHARATA
WHAT DO THEY SIGNIFY

K. M. VARMA

SEVEN WORDS IN BHARATA

What Do They Signify

SEVEN WORDS IN BHARATA
WHAT DO THEY SIGNIFY

K. M. VARMA

ORIENT LONGMANS
BOMBAY * CALCUTTA * MADRAS * NEW DELHI

ORIENT LONGMANS PRIVATE LTD.
17 CHITTARANJAN AVENUE, CALCUTTA 13
NICOL ROAD, BALLARD ESTATE, BOMBAY 1
36A MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS 2
KANSON HOUSE, 24/1 ASAF ALI ROAD, NEW DELHI 1
GUNFOUNDRY ROAD, HYDERABAD 1
17 NAZIMUDDIN ROAD, DACCA

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
6 & 7 CLIFFORD STREET, LONDON W. 1
AND AT
NEW YORK, TORONTO, CAPE TOWN AND MELBOURNE

First Published October 1958

PRINTED BY S.C. GHOSE, AT THE CALCUTTA PRESS
PRIVATE LTD., 1, WELLINGTON SQUARE, CALCUTTA.

Dedicated

to

My Dearest German Friend

PROF. DR. WILHELM RAU

CONTENTS

BOOKS UTILISED
AND
THEIR ABBREVIATIONS

A.	*Aṣṭādhyāyī*, Pāṇini.
A.B.	*Abhinava-Bhāratī*, Abhinavagupta, Gaekwad's Oriental Series (G.O.S.), no. 36, Vol. I, 1st ed., 1926, 2nd ed., 1956. *Unless specified, references are to the 2nd edition.* no. 68, Vol. II, 1934 and no. 124, Vol. III, 1954 (both of these have uptill now one edition only), Baroda.
A.K.	*Amarakośa*, Amarasiṃha, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. XXXIII, Trivandrum, 1914.
B.P.	*Bhāvaprakāśa*, Śāradātanaya, G.O.S., No. XLV, Baroda, 1930.
D.S.L.	*Drama in Sanskrit Literature*, R.V. Jāgīrdār, 1st ed., Popular Book Dept., Bombay, 1947.
E.T. of *N.Ś.*	English Translation of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, Dr. Manomohan Ghosh, Vol. I, Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1950.
H.C.S.L.	*History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*, M. Krishnamāchāriar, 1st ed., Tirupati, 1937.
H.D.S.	*History of Dharma Śāstra*, P. V. Kāṇe, Vol. I, 1st ed. Govt. Oriental Series, Class B, No. 6, Bhaṇḍārkar Oriental Institute, Poona, 1930.
H.S.P. (De)	*History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Sushīl Kumār De, Vol. I, 1923, Vol. II, 1925, Luzac, London.
H.S.P. (Kāṇe)	*History of Sanskrit Poetics*, P.V. Kāṇe, revised ed., 1951, Pāṇḍuraṅga Vāman Kāṇe, Angre's Wāḍi, Girgaon, Bombay 4. Printed in the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, Bombay.
I.H.Q.	*Indian Historical Quarterly*, Calcutta.
K.M.	*Kāvyamīmāṃsā*, Rājaśekhara, G.O.S., No. I, 3rd ed., Baroda, 1934.
M.B.	*Mahābhāṣya*, (on Panini's Astadyayi), Patañjali.
N.R.	*The Number of Rasas*, V. Rāghavan, 1st ed., Adyar Library, Madras, 1940.
N.Ś.	*Nāṭyaśāstra*, Bharata, G.O.S. (same as in the case of A.B.).
N.Ś. (Chow.)	Same as above, but published in *Kāśī* Sanskrit Series, no. 60, 1st ed., Banaras, 1929.
N.Ś. (K.M.)	Same as above, but published in *Kāvya-mālā* Seires, no. 42, 2nd ed., Bombay, 1943.
N:T.M.R.	*Nāṭya, Nṛtta and Nṛtya: Their Meaning and Relation*, K.M. Varma, 1st ed., Orient Longmans, Calcutta, 1957.
S.D.	*Sanskrit Drama*, A. Berriedale Keith, Oxford, 1924.

PREFACE

THIS work, elsewhere referred to as *Problems Connected with Some Technical Terms Used by Bharata*, has now been changed to *Seven Words in Bharata: What do They Signify*. This has a history, rather personal, but I feel obliged to mention it.

Till very late I did not know that I would ever be called upon to write a book dealing only with the textual problems of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. I started writing it more as a by-product while working on the *Sāttvikabhāvas*. So long as I was studying *alaṅkāra* at the feet of my esteemed *guru*, *Mahāmahopadhyāya*, *Kalāprapūrṇa*, Tātā Śubbarāya Śāstri gāru of Vizianagaram, I did not doubt the familiar or popular explanation of the *Sāttvikabhāvas*. It was later when I began to study the texts on *alaṅkāra* independently that I felt a growing discontent with the usual explanations. By the time my ideas took concrete shape I was engaged in working on Indian Iconometry in Viśva-Bhāratī under the late Dr. P.C. Bāgchi, then Director of Research and later Vice-Chancellor of Viśva-Bhāratī, and the impulse to write something on the *Sāttvikabhāvas* became irresistible. When I asked him for his views, with his habitual generosity he gave me ready encouragement, and I proceeded with the work.

I noticed early that the interpretation of the *Sāttvikabhāvas* was a centre of considerable controversy, especially up to the time of Abhinavagupta and to some extent till the thirteenth or fourteenth century A.D. I could trace more than a dozen schools of interpretations. Although some of these may not be quite distinct from the rest, yet these will prove the awareness of the older scholars and the importance of the problem. It was in the still later centuries, with one or two exceptions, that people began to feel complacent and a theory probably established or at least propagated by Bhaṭṭanāyaka, came to be accepted by and large. The same tendency is being repeated in our own day. Even those who have made a special study of Abhinava do not realise that he belongs to the *prāṇa* school of interpretation, if he is not its founder. They also attribute to him the theory found in the *Daśarūpaka* which probably is

borrowed from Bhaṭṭanāyaka. I mention this only to indicate the state of things as they exist now.

In the meantime the work on the subject, i.e. on the *Sāttvikabhāvas*, had made progress and I gave some portions to Dr. Bāgchi for his scrutiny. These contained a fairly large amount of material either in the body of the work or in the footnotes, the material which is the subject of the present work. He mentioned that these would disturb the continuity of the subject and asked me to reduce or even to eliminate these, if possible. Then I put to him the difficulties that may arise in connection with the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, if such material is eliminated. I agreed, however, to deal with these problems independently, as I felt that it is indispensable to tackle the textual problems before one expresses one's views on the *Sāttvṭkabhāvas* on the basis of the *Nāṭyaśāstra*. When I made an attempt in this work to deal exclusively with the textual problems of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, it is needless to state that I have used not only the material which originally belonged to my *Studies in Sāttvikabhāvas*, but also a large amount of additional material.

By the end of 1955 this work was almost in its final stages and I read a paper at the Oriental Conference held at Aṇṇamalai University. When I returned from the Conference, Dr. Bāgchi had passed away. For various reasons I could not take up the work until the summer vacation in 1957 when it received its final shape. Meanwhile the second edition of the first volume of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* had come out and I could make use of it. So far as the references to the first seven chapters of the *Nātyasāstra* are concerned I have changed them to the second edition because very few people possess the first edition. I have also made use of Śjt. Rāma-swāmi Śāstri's introduction to the book. I am happy that at long last I am able to place this work before scholars in the field though it would be difficult to say when the work on the *Sāttvikabhāvas*, with which the present work was started, will be completed.

For reasons already stated I must first pay respect to my patron and *guru*, Dr. Bāgchi. I feel sad that I could not put the finished work in his hands. Dr. Śiśir Kumār Ghose has, as before, worked behind the scenes, the task of putting the manuscript into shape has been largely his. Śjt. Śāntidev Ghosh has been, as usual, a pillar of support, while Mr. Roy B. North has extended his helping

hand once again. To all of these gentlemen I am more grateful than I can say. My thanks are due to my friend Mr. Hariśankar Śarma for the trouble he took in going through the typescript. Last, but not least, the staff of Orient Longmans Private Ltd., Calcutta, deserve my thanks for the care with which they have seen the book through the press.

K.M. VARMA

Śāntiniketan
Bhādra 21, 1880 (Śakābda)
12th Sept., 1958.

SEVEN WORDS IN BHARATA: WHAT DO THEY SIGNIFY

INTRODUCTION

THE importance of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* in Indian classical literature has never been questioned and in recent times a number of editions have been published. All the same many textual problems remain unsolved and unanswered. A correct and complete text is our first necessity. This is a big task. For the present we have attempted to deal with some of its textual problems, centring round Bharata's use of seven technical terms. From time to time we have differed with his interpreters. This, however, it is needless to say, does not imply any disrespect. We ought also to add that for the sake of emphasis we have not hesitated to resort to repetition. If this involves a certain sacrifice of literary grace, that cannot be helped.

A correct and complete text, we have said, is our first necessity. The scope for a critical study of Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* is now greater than ever before. For one thing we now have three different Indian editions based on over forty MSS collected from all over India. But since no edition can legitimately claim to be critical, scholars continue to feel handicapped. And yet it need not be so, for a critical study does not necessarily depend upon the number of manuscripts alone. Critical study may as well be interpretative. That is the position we take, and we propose to discuss seven technical terms used by Bharata, terms not connected with any of the arts expounded in the *Nāṭyaśāstra* but which could throw some light on the textual problems. For this purpose an immense quantity of MSS is not a *sine qua non*, for the task is one of interpretation rather than of collation. In this, as we shall see, the availability, though partly, of *Abhinava-Bhāratī* in print is a boon.

The terms which we propose to take up are:

1. *sūtra*,
2. *bhāṣya*,
3. *saṅgraha*,
4. *kārikā*,
5. *nirukta*,
6. *ānuvaṃśya and*
7. *nidarśana*.

From some of the ancient texts as well as the labours of the modern scholars it becomes plain that there were a host of works meant for the elucidation of the *N.Ś.*, some of which bear that evidence quite obviously, while the others reveal that concern from the very nature of their treatment of the subject matter, for instance, Harṣa's *Vārtika*. But none of them is available today, except the one which has been mentioned, viz. *Abhinava-Bhāratī* written by Abhinavagupta either at the end of the tenth or the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. Although a few matters of those early commentaries are available from some of the later works, yet they are not concerned with the questions undertaken here. Extremely few such references, i.e. the references concerned with the present questions, of the early commentaries are to be found only in the *A.B.* But as they are quite scanty, it is impossible to derive from them a complete idea about the interpretations or views of those early writers.

As it is, we are to depend only on the *A.B.* for both purposes — to note, so far as is possible, the earlier views on these seven words, and to reach a definite conclusion about Abhinava's own interpretation. In modern times, too, there has been much discussion about the textual problems of the *N.Ś.*, including, in a broad sense, the problems with which we are here concerned. But as we shall find, the modern discussions are not quite free from Abhinava's interpretation, which itself is not quite satisfactory. Hence there is scope for a new interpretation, as attempted here. Our discussion shall consist of three parts: the first part will be devoted to an exposition of the older interpretations, including those of the modern scholars who agree with or echo the same; the second part will put forward a critical and independent interpretation, i.e. our own; and lastly, the third part will deal with some further textual problems in the light of our new interpretation of these seven technical terms.

PART I

OLD INTERPRETATIONS

ABHINAVA'S INTERPRETATION

FOR the first time Bharata uses all the seven words — *sūtra, bhāṣya, saṅgraha, kārikā, nirukta, ānuvaṃśya* and *nidarśana* — in the sixth chapter of his *Nāṭyaśāstra*. Here Abhinava has occasion to interpret them. It may be noted here that the last two words are used in the seventh chapter as well as in some of the succeeding chapters.

NATURE OF THE FIVE QUESTIONS OF THE SIXTH CHAPTER

THE sixth Ch. is mainly devoted to *rasa*, but before this topic is actually started there is an introductory portion where the first five of these words are used, i.e. in the very beginning of the sixth Ch. According to Abhinava the verses with which the sixth Ch. begins read as follows:

> *pūrvaraṅgavidhiṃ śrutvā puna rāhur munisattamāḥ*
> *bharataṃ munayas sarve praśnān pañcābhidhatsva naḥ*
>
> *ye rasā iti paṭhyante nāṭye nāṭyavicakṣaṇāḥ*
> *rasatvaṃ kena vai teṣā meta dākhyātu marhasi*
>
> *bhāvaś caiva kathaṃ proktāḥ kiṃ vā te bhāvayantyapi*
> *saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ caiva tattvataḥ*[1]

It is obvious from the first verse that Bharata starts with this new topic in the usual fashion of raising the questions as also by mentioning their number as five. But the problem comes with Abhinava in specifying the five questions distinctly. In reality, Abhinava does not recognise their separate and independent status. Or, to be more precise, he thinks that these questions do not introduce anything new, but only imply the need for clarification

[1] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, pp. 260–1.

of certain matters related to the five questions already posed in the first Ch.[2] (Hereafter we shall mention the set of five questions of the first Ch. as former questions and that of the sixth Ch. as latter questions.) He is unable to accept the independent status of the latter questions, because, in his view, all the necessary questions regarding *nāṭya* have already been raised in the first Ch. In his opinion a set of further questions with regard to *nāṭya* in general is not required.

It is with this view that he begins his commentary on the first verse of the sixth Ch. and determines the nature of the present questions. The following line is seen in his commentary in the beginning of the sixth Ch.: '*pūrvaraṅgavidhiṃ śrutveti pañca praśnāniti|rasānāṃ kena rasatva mityekaḥ praśnaḥ.*'[3] Before and after this line some portions of the commentary are missing in the printed text. (Perhaps the lost lines are several and not one or two.) From the above it appears that the present five questions are shown numerically, but it is not possible to be certain whether he counts these according to his own idea or is quoting someone else's theory in order to criticise it. But anyhow it is not difficult to know his views from the portion wherefrom his commentary is continuously available.

After calling forth those five questions of the first Ch., he says '*tena pūrvapraśnitavastutattvanirṇaya eva kriyatāmiti tātparyam*',[4] again in the same topic, '*tena prādhānyā daṅgapraśnāntarbhūta mapyetatpunaḥpraśnita mityarthaḥ punaḥpraśnābhiprāyeṇaivākhyātu marhasītyupapannam/Pūrvākhyāneṣu tu puna rukta mabhidhatsvetyuktatvāt*'.[5] Further, he observes that '*evaṃ prādhānyāt praśnapañcakāntaram/vastutaḥ punaḥ pañcapraśnī pūrvoktaiveyaṃ visphāryate saṅ-*

[2] '*nāṭyavedaḥ kathaṃ brahman utpannaḥ kasya vā kṛte / katyaṅgaḥ kiṃ pramāṇaś ca prayogaś cāsya kīdṛśaḥ //* Ibid., Ch. 1, p. 6.

Commenting on this verse Abhinava shows the five questions in his own way, opposing some of the views expressed by his predecessors. His way of showing the questions is not acceptable, the reasons for which need not be mentioned now.

[3] *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 260, l. 6.

[4] Ibid., l. 17. Also see other matters said in this page.

[5] Ibid., p. 261, ll. 15-16. In the printed text this is read incorrectly as in the first edn. (p. 263 as '*aṅgābhinayapraśnāntarbhūta mapi*'). It is quoted above with our correction.

grahā diti cābhidhatsva.'[6] These three quotations are quite sufficient to give a clear idea about his views. The essence of these is that the present five questions introduce nothing new which is not already mentioned in the former questions. This does not mean, he further specifies, that these questions repeat the things in the same order as mentioned in the former five questions, but these questions come out of one of those five, viz. the question concerned with the *aṅgas* of *nāṭya*.[7] The reason for resuming the inquiry regarding the matters of the third of the former questions, he observes, is nothing but the great importance of *rasas* as well as *bhāvas*. He takes the words *abhidhatsva* and *ākhyātu marhasi* (used in the first and second verses respectively) as a clue to conclude these things—first, that recalling the matters of the former questions in general, and second, that the latter five questions are the outcome of one of the former questions.

It is with such a view that Abhinava proceeds to count and specify the present five questions. It may be argued here otherwise, that the given understanding follows from the specification itself. But he looks upon them as a mere resumption of some of the matters of the former questions. Here, we repeat, it should be noted that Abhinava always seems to have in mind that there is no need for raising the question again with regard to the matters concerned with *nāṭya* in general, when such questions have already been raised and decided.

He specifies them along with the following introductory sentence: '*tena ādaraviṣayatvāt rase praśnāntaraṃ bhūtāvṛtyā, vismayasthānatvāt bhāveṣu praśnacatuṣkam*'.[8] He says that as the *rasa* is most desirable, a question in the way of resumption (*bhūtāvṛttyā*) is devoted to it.

[6] Ibid., p. 262, ll. 6-7.

[7] This particular question is the third of the five which are quoted in footnote 2 and this is answered in the first Ch. itself in the following verse:

jagrāha pāṭhya mṛgvedāt sāmabhyo gīta meva ca /
yajurvedā dabhinayān rasā nadharvaṇā dapi //

N.Ś., Vol. I, Ch. 1, p. 14. Certain lines in the commentary of this verse in print seem irregular and interrupted one by the other. Abhinava's interpretation of the first line of this verse is not acceptable.

[8] *A.B.*, Vol. I, p. 261. Particularly around this place a number of incorrect readings occur and a faulty punctuation is followed in the 1st edn. These are corrected in the 2nd edn., and in addition Śāstri suggests a reading as

He carefully averts the situation by not using repetition (*punarukti*) and using resumption (*bhūtāvṛttyā*) instead. He explains next that the rest of the four questions are devoted to *bhāvas*, as they are occasions of wonder. *Bhāvas*, according to him, are occasions of wonder[9] because of their (sudden) mention along with *rasas* in verses like *khinnānāṃ rasabhāveṣu*, when a reference even to their name has not been made in places like *jagrāha pāṭhyam*, etc., where the *aṅgas* of *nāṭya* are counted. Thus making the ground for his specification of the five questions, he explains what is meant by the different questions of this latter set.

SPECIFICATION OF THE LATTER FIVE QUESTIONS

If these five questions are presented according to his explanation they would run as follows:

I. How do those that read (i.e. said) as *rasas* have the *rasatva*,[10] (genesis or reason for the designation as such)?
II. How are *bhāvas* mentioned in places like *khinnānām*, etc., when a reference even to their name has not been made in places like *jagrāha pāṭhyam*, etc., where the *aṅgas* of *nāṭya* are specified?[11]
III. The etymology of the word *bhāva* may possibly be given in two ways: *bhavantīti bhāvāḥ* and *bhāvayantīti bhāvāḥ*, then what is it (i.e. which of these is meant)?
IV. If the former is its etymology, then what do they make? In the latter case do they pervade?
V. In both these cases what would be their function?

[12]

follows: *praśnāntaraṃ (ra) bhūtāvṛttyā*, but it is not necessary. With the punctuation followed by us above, the meaning would be quite clear.

[9] For this explanation see below where the four questions related to *bhāvas* are specified. Also see *A.B.*, Vol. I, p. 343 para 2, *yacca paunaruktyaṃ*, etc.

[10] For his explanation *see* ibid., p. 261; also *see* pp. 288-9, where commenting on Bharata's statement '*atrāha—rasa iti kaḥ padārthaḥ, ucyate, āsvādyatvāt*', he says that the *rasatva* is *kriyāpravṛttinimitta* of *rasa* and concludes by saying '*evaṃ rasatvaṃ kena vai teṣā miti yatpraśnitaṃ tatpratisamāhitam*' (p. 290).

[11] '*rasasahabhāvena bhāvāḥ kecana proktāḥ khinnānā mityatra, te ca kena*

According to Abhinava the five questions, as specified above, are present only in one and a half verses, i.e. the second verse and the first half of the third verse of the sixth Ch. One may not be able to find them present in those one and a half verses, but he says thus, taking as clues the particles *ca*, *vā*, and *api* that are used in the first half of the third verse (*see* footnote 11).

EXPLANATION OF THE NEED FOR SAṄGRAHA, KĀRIKĀ AND NIRUKTA

It is obvious from Bharata's text that the portion concerning the questions does not end with the first half of the third verse, with which Abhinava concludes the series of five questions, but it extends to the second half, viz. '*saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ caiva tattvataḥ*' (i.e. till the end of the third verse). This second half of the third verse becomes a problem for Abhinava. So in order to tackle it, he breaks '*tattvataḥ*' into three words—*tat*, *tu* and *ataḥ*. Taking the word *tat* to stand for '*ākhyāna*' referred to in the sentence '*etadākhyātu marhasi*' (verse 2), he interprets it thus: as the matters mentioned in *aṅgas* are to be elaborated (ākhyāna) only through the *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*, which mainly stood for '*uddeśa*' (table of contents) '*lakṣaṇa*' (definition) and 'nirukta' (examination) respectively, these (*saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*)

prakāreṇoktāḥ? jagrāhetyādau tu hi teṣāṃ nāmāpi na śrutam / atheteṣveva bhāvaśabdaḥ pravartitaḥ tatrāpi bhavantīti vyutpattir bhāvayantīti ki metat/ki mutpādayanti atha vyāpnuvanti / dvayoḥ karma kiṃ syāt? iti vā-śabdena ca-śabdenāpi-śabdena ca catvāro bhāveṣu praśnāḥ'. Ibid, pp. 261-2. (The punctuation shown here does not follow either of the edns., as they do not seem to be precise, so it is shown here according to our understanding.) One notable point here is that in his commentary there is no mention of *eva* (*bhāvāścaiva kathaṃ proktāḥ*). However nothing at present can be decided on the basis of this. The different readings here seem worth investigating.

[12] For his detailed views on these also *see* (7th Ch.) pp. 342-6, and particularly p. 343, paragraphs second and third. Without taking into account the views expressed there also, the correct meaning of his approach here could not be clearly understood. A further point is that in his opinion both of these etymologies of *bhāva* are acceptable. This would be quite clear from the above referred portion of his commentary and his observation that '*sāmājikābhiprāyeṇa yo vyutpattidvayanirūpito'rthaḥ tatsaṅgrahāya ślokadvaya māha*', p. 345.

should be said (*tasmānno'bhidhatsva*)[13]. In this manner Abhinava justifies the inclusion of those three items which according to him do not fall under the five questions proper, or in the text devoted to the questions.

To sum up the matters said by Abhinava till now, the present set of the five questions does not bring any new matters regarding *nāṭya* in general that are not raised by a set of the five questions of the first Ch., and moreover the present questions, precisely speaking, are the outcome of the third question of the former set, viz. *katyaṅgaḥ*. The resumption of inquiry is admissible owing to the importance of the *rasa* and *bhāvas*. Out of these five questions one is concerned with *rasa* while the rest deal with *bhāvas*. The text from here onwards is meant for the elaboration of the *aṅga* question and such an elaboration would be possible only through the *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. Therefore, these three must also be explained here.

ABHINAVA'S INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST FIVE WORDS

ABHINAVA's interpretation of the words *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*—which is our centre of interest—can now be seen more clearly, after fully aquainting ourselves with his notion about the nature of the present five questions and the position of the three items (*saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*), the notion which influences to some extent his interpretation of those words. We shall now proceed to the meanings given by him to the first five words.

SŪTRA, BHĀṢYA AND SAṄGRAHA EXPLAINED

IN accordance with Abhinava the further text that follows the part devoted to questions reads thus:

teṣāṃ tu vacanaṃ śrutvā munīnāṃ bharato muniḥ
pratyuvāca punar vākyaṃ rasabhāva-vikalpanam

[13] '*nanu tai riha kiṃ prayojanaṃ, āha tattvata iti / tuśabdo hetau, tadityākhyānaṃ parāmṛṣṭaṃ, yatas tadākhyānaṃ ata evaibhyas saṅgrahādibhya uddeśa-lakṣaṇa-parīkṣādiṣu prādhānyāt tadupakrama meva sarva mabhidheyaṃ [sarvātmanābhidheyaṃ?] .. .. tasmānno'bhidhatsva*'. Ibid., p. 262.

ahaṃ vaḥ kathayiṣyāmi nikhilena tapodhanāḥ
saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ ca yathākramam

na śakya masya nāṭyasya gantu mantaṃ kathañcana
kasmāt bahutvād jñānānāṃ śilpānāṃ vāpyanantataḥ

eksyāpi na vai śakya mantaṃ jñānārṇavasya hi
gantuṃ kiṃ puna ranyeṣāṃ jñānānā marthatattvataḥ

kintvalpasūtragranthārtha manumānaprasādhakam
nāṭyasyāsya pravakṣyāmi rasabhāvādisaṅgraham

vistareṇopadiṣṭānā marthānāṃ sūtra-bhāṣyayoḥ
nibandho yas samāsena saṅgrahaṃ taṃ vidur budhāḥ

rasā bhāvā hyabhinayāḥ dharmī-vṛtti-pravṛttayaḥ
siddhis svarās tathātodyaṃ gānaṃ raṅgaś ca saṅgrahaḥ[14]

In Abhinava's view the fifth and sixth of the above quoted verses are devoted to the definition of the *saṅgraha*, while the rest of the preceding verses are introductory to the present topic.

Therefore, it is not necessary here to enter into the details of his commentary on the first four verses quoted above, except to notice a fact important for the purpose of the study. He says that except by the method of using these three—*saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*—it is impossible to explain all the matters connected with *nāṭya*.[15] This means that *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta* should be dealt with at first; in fact he says it (also *see* footnote 13).

According to Abhinava, Bharata defines the *saṅgraha* in the verse *kintvalpasūtra*, etc., whereas the other verse, *vistareṇa*, etc., is written only to illustrate the fact that others too think in the same manner ('*anye'pyeva meva manyanta iti darśayati vistareṇeti*'). With this view Abhinava identifies their meanings (*see* footnote 20), so it is necessary to concentrate on the matters said in the commentary of the verse *kintvalpasūtra*, etc.,

[14] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śls.* 4-10, pp. 261-3.

[15] '*kathañcanetyamuṃ saṅgrahādiprakāraṃ varjayitvānyena pratipadanirūpaṇādinā ityarthaḥ / Yatkila pratipadaṃ nirūpayituṃ na śakyaṃ tallakṣaṇadvāreṇocyate; lakṣaṇasyaivāṅga uddeśaparīkṣe, viṣayapradarśane pariśuddhau ca tayor vyāpārāt, nacātra pratipadaṃ nirūpaṇaṃ śakya* miti*'. *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 262. *second edn. reads *yukta miti*, but is not preferable. We made two amendations in this passage.

Taking the fourth line of the verse to consist of two words, *rasabhāvādi* and *saṅgraha*, Abhinava interprets that the *saṅgraha*, otherwise called *uddeśa*,[16] is the one where the subjects meant to be defined and examined respectively in *sūtra* (=*lakṣaṇa*, i.e. definition) and *grantha* (=*bhāṣyagrantha* i.e. *parīkṣaṇa*, examination) are mentioned briefly, i.e. just by name. Actually[17] in his opinion this much is the definition of *saṅgraha*. However, there are other adjectives used to qualify it, such as *rasabhāvādi* and *anumānaprasādhakam*. He interprets the former as describing the way[18] in which *saṅgraha* is said, while the latter as describing the use of it.[19] It means, then, that the *saṅgraha* is commenced with *rasas* and *bhāvas* and it accomplishes the inference.

Although Abhinava identifies[20] the meanings of the two verses (viz. *kintvalpasūtra* and *vistareṇa*), saying that the former of these convey Bharata's idea and the latter that of the others, yet he nowhere states his reasons explicitly. Nevertheless we may assume that he takes as clue for his commentary the two sentences—*pravakṣyāmi . . . saṅgraham* and *saṅgrahaṃ taṃ vidur budhāḥ*—respectively from the former and latter verses, may be more particularly the two words *pravakṣyāmi* and *viduḥ*. Whatever his reasons for it, the thing to note here is that Abhinava assumes that Bharata is here only quoting an older or contemporary identical opinion, but without mentioning the fact specifically. Particularly notable from the commentary on these two verses are the meanings given to three words, *sūtra*, *bhāṣya* and *saṅgraha*.

16 *'saṅgrahaṃ saṅkṣipya gṛhyate'neneti ta muddeśam'*. Ibid., p. 263.

17 *'tasya saṅgrahasya svarūpa māha—sūtrabhāṣyagranthayor lakṣaṇaparīkṣayor yo'rtho lakṣyaparīkṣitavyalakṣaṇaḥ so'lpaḥ saṅkucito nāmamātreṇoddeśyatayā yatra'*. Ibid.

18 *'pravakṣyāmi, kathaṃ? rasabhāvādikṛtvā, prādhānyāt tadupakramamityarthaḥ'*. Ibid.

19 *'kiṃ tenetyāha—anumānalakṣaṇaṃ taddhi*[i] *kevalavyatirekiheturūpaṃ tasya coddeśadharmiṇaṃ*[ii] *prakalpayan prakṛṣṭas sādhakaḥ āśrayāsiddhatvaśaṇkāśamanena pakṣadharmatvamūlāṅgapoṣakatvāt'*. Ibid. The following two variants are noted in the first edn.: (*i*) *tatkhalu* and (*ii*) *coddeśo dharmiṇaḥ*. Still the meaning is not clear (at least to us) so it is explained above only in a general way.

20 *'anyepyeva meva manyanta iti darśayati / sūtraṃ lakṣaṇaṃ bhāṣyaṃ tadvyaktīkaraṇarūpā parīkṣā / alpau sūtragranthau yatrārthe so'rtho yatreti tu vyākhyānamanena ślokena saṃvadate'*. Ibid.

According to Abhinava:

I. *sūtra* means *lakṣaṇa* that is the definition,

II. *bhāṣya* and *grantha* are synonyms, or *grantha* should be taken as a short form for *bhāṣya-grantha*. *Bhāṣya* means *parīkṣā*, examination (it goes without saying that so does the word in the compound word, *sūtra-grantha* or a simple word *grantha*),

III. *saṅgraha* is *uddeśa*, that is the enumeration of the subjects to be dealt with.

Abhinava accepts all the eleven items enumerated in the *saṅgraha* verse (Ch. 6, *Śl.* 10) quoted above, while Baṭṭodbhaṭa and his followers hold a quite different view in this matter, on which Bhaṭṭalollaṭa opposes them. But it is not certain whether or not the meanings given by Abhinava to these words—*sūtra*, *bhāṣya* and *saṅgraha*—would be acceptable to them. What kind of meanings they might give to these words we do not know. Therefore it is better to leave such matters at present.

KĀRIKĀ EXPLAINED

THE next word that calls for attention is *kārikā*. According to Abhinava the verse describing *kārikā* reads as follows:

> *alpābhidhānenārtho yaḥ samāsenocyate budhaiḥ*
> *sūtrataḥ sānumantavyā (-nupaṭhitā) kārikārthapradarśinī*[21]

Before showing how he interpretes it, it is necessary to clarify certain matters. He starts by keeping in mind three matters distinctly, viz. (*i*) the defining words or sentence (*lakṣaṇavācakaśabda* or *tadvācakaśabdātmakaṃ vākyam*); (*ii*) the definition (*lakṣaṇa*); and (*iii*) that which is to be defined (*lakṣya* or *lakṣaṇīya* or *lakṣitavya*). In this context he uses the word *artha* in the sense of 'thing' in order to cover, according to the necessity, the different things like *lakṣaṇa*, *lakṣya*, etc.

Abhinava is certainly under the impression that the *ānuvaṃśya* verses quoted by Bharata are *kārikās*. If he admits *ānuvaṃśyas* alone are *kārikās*, that would lead to absurdity. He has committed himself to the opinion that without *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*

[21] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śl.* 11, p. 264. Perhaps based on Abhinava's clarification, '*yā anupaścāt paṭhitā*', Śāstri suggests a reading, *anupaṭhitā*. *Sā tu vijñeyā* is the reading that followed in the first edn., which is decidedly correct.

the latter set of five questions cannot be answered. In fact, without quoting *ānuvaṃśyas* Bharata could have expounded the matters (i.e. *rasa* and *bhāvas*) asked for in the latter five questions, as he could several other things, because, after all, these are nothing but earlier verses. Everything depends on Bharata, this is one fact. There is another fact too. As Bharata always quotes *ānuvaṃśyas* at the end of prose passages, where much is discussed about the respective matters, Abhinava cannot argue that Bharata does not define various subjects by himself and is content to utilise earlier *ānuvaṃśyas* for this purpose instead. This would be nothing short of absurdity. So Abhinava cannot rest by just accepting that *ānuvaṃśyas* alone are *kārikās*. If he accepts that only *kārikā* means *sūtra* alias Bharata's aphorism, he cannot explain why Bharata defines it under the name *kārikā* leaving the name *sūtra* or *lakṣaṇa* and why he quotes *ānuvaṃśyas* supposed to be *kārikās*. This is another absurdity. This is perhaps why Abhinava takes a round about way in order to get over these difficulties, and at the outset of his commentary on this verse he states that this particular verse is meant to show how *lakṣaṇa*, i.e. the definition, is called *kārikā*.[22] If definition alone is *kārikā* there cannot be any variety in it and then he cannot explain Bharata's aphorism as well as *ānuvaṃśyas* under the appellation *kārikā*. So he says that defining sentences also are attributively called *kārikās* and those defining sentences are two—Bharata's *sūtras*, i.e. the first parts of prose passages, as well as *ānuvaṃśyas* which are quoted at the end of prose passages.

All this he sees in the verse quoted above. He takes the whole verse except the last word, *arthapradarśinī*, and considers it as one sentence and in his opinion it means: The thing which is made according to the aphorism of Bharata (*sūtraṃ vācaka māśritya*), yet with fewer words, (*alpaiś śabdaiḥ=alpābhidhānena*) as it may cover hundreds of the examples (*lakṣya*), is called *kārikā*, because it helps in understanding, i.e. easy understanding[23] (*jñaptisādhakatvāt*). Thus it is a variety of *kārikā*, viz. *ānuvaṃśya*. Again Abhinava takes the whole of the second half of the same verse and considers it to be

[22] '*atha kārikāṃ lakṣayatyalpābhidhāneneti / anenārthasya kārikātvaṃ lakṣaṇarūpasya darśayati*'. *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch, 6, p. 264.

[23] '*yo'rtho'lpaiḥ śabhaiḥ samāsena bahutaralakṣya-saṅgraheṇa sūtraṃ vācaka māśritya ucyate so'rthaḥ kārikā jñaptisādhakatvāt.*' Ibid.

another sentence and according to him it means: The one which contains or holds in it the definition [*tad* (*lakṣaṇa*) *arthinī*] is *kārikā* because of its defining nature[24] (*sūtrataḥ sūtraṇena*). Thus it is another variety of *kārikā*, namely Bharata's sentence, i.e. the first parts of the prose passages. The same, i.e. the existence of two varieties of defining sentences, is clearly expressed by him also in his introductory remark to the above interpretation.[25]

In this way, that is by advancing the theory that the defining sentences are attributively called *kārikā*, which originally means *lakṣaṇa*, Abhinava shows two varieties of *kārikās*, namely Bharata's aphorism and secondly *ānuvaṃśyas*. The theory of attribution he mentions specifically: '*tadarthaprakāśakatvāt śloko'pyupacārāt kārikā*.' At the very first sight it is clear from this sentence that he thinks of *ānuvaṃśya* to be *kārikā* attributively. In his opinion it is true in case of Bharata's sentence also, because he uses *śloko'pi*. As a matter of fact, even in the absence of this word *api* one has to understand that Abhinava calls Bharata's sentence also as *kārikā* only attributively (*upacāra*), otherwise it is impossible for Abhinava to explain these matters logically.

To put it in a simple way, according to Abhinava Bharata's sentence or aphorism is *kārikā* because it is *arthapradarśanakāriṇī* (here *artha* means definition itself but not to be defined) and *ānuvaṃśya* is also *kārikā* because it is *jñaptikāriṇī*. He is compelled to adopt this view only because of his confused ideas and the complex theory that results from it. Although he calls Bharata's aphorism and *ānuvaṃśya* also as *kārikā*, yet by attaching a supreme importance to the former, he makes a lot of difference between them. In his opinion the former is the essentially adoptable (*samyak śrayyatayā*) on the basis of which the latter is made in an explanatory nature of the former, but using fewer words in order to aid the reader in understanding it, i.e. the definition itself. All this he says[26] after the interpretation of *kārikā* as defining sentences.

[24] '*tadarthinī kārikā, sūtrataḥ sūtraṇena, tena sūtra mapi kārikā*.' Ibid. The punctuation followed here in the second edn. is incorrect while it is correct in the first edn.

[25] '*tadvācakasya sūtrasya tatsaṅkṣiptārtha-vivaraṇātmakasya ca ślokasyānena lakṣaṇavākyaṃ dvidheti tātparyam*.' Ibid.

[26] '*tatsūtra mapekṣya yā anu paścāt paṭhitā ślokarūpā sāpi kārikā / tathā hi—*

At the end he recalls[27] the very matter said at the outset, namely that *kārikā* means *lakṣaṇa*, the definition which is to be presented at the beginning of a given subject in *sūtra* form and at the end in *śloka*[28] form. In this we notice that he suggests the places where the two different defining sentences, otherwise called *kārikās*, are used.

If all these matters are put concisely they would be as follows:

I. *Kārikā* originally means *lakṣaṇa*, the definition.
II. But the defining sentences are two, such as
  (*a*) Bharata's aphorism and
  (*b*) *ānuvaṃśya* verses.
III. These two also are attributively called *kārikās.*
IV. Between them Bharata's aphorism is most essential on which the latter, i.e. *ānuvaṃśya*, is dependent and a bit explanatory to it.

Recalling the matters noted in the definition of *saṅgraha* and combining with these, we should note here that Abhinava takes the word *sūtra* to mean the definition (*lakṣaṇa*) and the defining sentence (*lakṣaṇavākya*) as well. The central point of the material discussed so far is that according to Abhinava's interpretation the above verse is of an informative nature, that is to say Bharata intends to define the subjects enlisted in *saṅgraha*, so he clarifies through this verse that he is going to give the definitions in two forms. It means reducing the significance of this verse almost to a nullity. After

sūcanātmakatvāt sūtrāt labdho yo'rtho lakṣaṇātmakaḥ sa eva samyagiti śrayyatayā (samyagatiśrayyatayā) parṇānyaneneti (varṇanātmaneti) vṛttabandhenocyamāno'lpaiś ca śabdair nirūpyamāṇo'rthasya lakṣaṇīyasya prakarṣaṃ dharmyantarāt vyavacchedaṃ darśayan dharmaḥ kārikā, kriyate'nena jñapti riti kārikā, lakṣaṇa miti yāvat / tadarthaprakāśakatvāt śloko'pyupacārāt kārikā.' Ibid.

[27] '*etaduktaṃ bhavati—uddiṣṭasya dharmyantaravyavaccedakaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ vaktavyam / tacca pūrvaṃ sūtreṇa tato'pyakṛtākṣepottaraprapañcena tadvivaraṇamātrarūpeṇa sukhagrāhyeṇa ślokena / ubhayorapi hi lakṣaṇa meva pratipādyam / tadeva kārikocyate.*' Ibid. Here after these exists a sentence in print, viz. '*sūtraślokāvupacārāditi*', but is shown in the first edn. in square brackets, for what reasons it is not clear. This sentence will ease the difficulty, if it is found in some MS.

[28] Here the word *śloka* does not mean *anuṣṭup* only, but the verse in general, covering *āryā* and *anuṣṭup* in which metres *ānuvaṃśyas* are found in the *N.Ś.*

noting Abhinavas's views on *kārikā* we now turn to *nirukata* which comes next in order of Bharata's treatment of these technical terms.

NIRUKTA EXPLAINED

IN the *N.Ś.* two verses are devoted to *nirukta*. Commenting on them Abhinava says in the *avataraṇikā* that *nirukta* is *parīkṣā*, examination ('*atha parīkṣātmakaṃ niruktaṃ lakṣayati ślokadvayena nānānāmetyādinā*'). According to Abhinava the two verses read thus:

> *nānānāmāśrayotpannaṃ nighaṇṭunigamānvitam*
> *dhātvarthahetusaṃyuktaṃ nānāsiddhāntasādhitam*
> *sthāpitortho bhavedyatra samāsenārthasūcakaḥ*
> *dhātvarthavacaneneha niruktaṃ tatpracakṣate*[29]

The nature of the *nirukta*, according to Abhinava, is actually defined only in the second verse. This is clear also from his bias to begin the commentary with the latter verse. Another important fact is that he does not accept this word *nirukta* as a *paribhāṣā* (technical term) in the strict sense. He does not, however, mention anything because of which this cannot be taken as a full-fledged technical term. But it seems here that the reason for this is that he interprets it as examination and not as definition, which is the commonly held meaning of the word. He takes the word *artha* to stand for definition (*lakṣaṇa*) and the second one, that of the compound word *arthasūcaka*, for the thing to be defined (*lakṣaṇīya*), and interprets it as follows.

The *nirukta*,[30] otherwise called *parīkṣā* (i.e. examination *parīkṣārūpaṃ niruktam*), is that where the definition (*lakṣaṇa*) which indicates briefly (*samasena saṅkṣepeṇa*) the thing to be defined is established through the process of raising questions against and answering them (*dhatvarthavacana*).[31]

[29] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śls.* 12-13, pp. 265-6.

[30] '*samāsena saṅkṣepeṇānekavyaktibhedabhinnasyārthasya lakṣaṇīyaṣya yas sūcako'rtho lakṣaṇātmakaḥ sa yatrākṣepapratisamādhānalakṣaṇe vastuni sati sthāpito bhavati tatparīkṣārūpaṃ niruktam / nacaivaṃ paribhāṣā / kintvartha metaṃ nirbhajyākṣepapratisamādhānābhyāṃ lakṣaṇasya vacana miti / etadāha dhātvarthavacaneneti.*' *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, pp. 264-5.

[31] He does not mention what kind of literal meaning he wants to put on

Thus it is clear that Abhinava interprets *nirukta* as *parīkṣā*, i.e. examination. He thinks that the method of conducting the examination, i.e. catechism, is shown in the former verse by Bharata in the use of the adverbs (*kriyāviśeṣaṇābhidhānadvāreṇākṣepapratisamādhānaprakāraṃ darśayati nānetyādinā*). Accordingly he breaks the verse into four compound words and explains that in the first three words the process of the examination connected with words is shown, whereas in the fourth one that of the subject matter. To enter into all these matters here would be tedious. In any case, they are not essential to an understanding of his interpretation and may as well be left out for the present.

But a remark by Abhinava at the end of his commentary on the former verse, cannot be so easily passed by. The purpose of the *nirukta*, he says, is to affirm the subject (*artha*) concisely.[32]

To sum up the points of note in Abhinava's interpretation of *nirukta*:

I. *Nirukta* means examination.
II. *Nirukta* is not a *paribhāṣā*, technical term.
III. The purpose of the *nirukta* is to affirm concisely the subject in question.

If we put together these matters with the things said in the definition of *saṅgraha*, we arrive at the following interesting conclusion: *grantha*, otherwise called *bhāṣya*, means *parīkṣā*, so does *nirukta*, and therefore *grantha*, *bhāṣya*, *nirukta* and *parīkṣā* are synonyms. (But to anticipate, these can be mentioned to be synonyms, only with qualifications.)

the word *dhātvartha-(vacana)*, but on the basis of the meaning he gives to the another usage, *dhātvartha*, it can be assumed that he takes the meaning, *kriyā*, 'action', in this place also. He seems to extend further its meaning thus: The use of this word calls forth the etymology, which in its turn brings the discussion in which the raising of questions against and answering them would be the main feature. He seems to arrive thus at this conclusion, yet he does not want to mention all this. Nevertheless, he gives the clue to it, by saying '*artha metaṃ nirbhajyākṣepapratisamādhānābhyāṃ lakṣaṇasya vacana miti / etadāha dhātvarthavacaneneti.*' If it is true, the meaning he ascribes to it in this way is quite a far-fetched one, if not fanciful.

[32] '*niruktasya tu prayojanaṃ saṅkṣepeṇārthāvadhāraṇaṃ, taduktaṃ sthāpita iti.*' *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 265.

From the matters discussed so far it has become clear what kind of meanings Abhinava gives to the five words, viz., *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. Still these matters do not end here and he continues the argument while dealing with certain aspects of the present topic. Without knowing these nothing can be said definitely about his theory.

According to Abhinava the verse which immediately follows the definition of *nirukta* reads thus:

saṅgraho yo mayā proktaḥ samāsena dvijottamāḥ
vistaraṃ tasya vakṣyāmi saniruktaṃ sakārikam.[33]

In fifteen[34] verses succeeding the above Bharata shows into how many varieties each subject mentioned in the *saṅgraha* is split up. According to Abhinava this is an introductory verse to the following division[35] (*vibhāga*). Therefore, taking the word *vistara* to mean *vibhāga*, he interprets this verse thus. The division of the *saṅgraha* will be shown now as it may end in examination (*parīkṣā*) and as it would be adorned with *kārikā* (i.e. *lakṣaṇa*=definition). By taking the words *saniruktam* and *sakārikam* as adverbs, he suggests that the division is not complete in itself, so everything available from the division should be examined. As the examination presupposes the definition, that too must be said. Thus interpreting this verse, he shows in this the scope to Bharata's individual treatment of every subject mentioned in what Abhinava describes here as *vibhāga*, division.

In keeping with the interpretation of this verse, Abhinava writes the *avataraṇikā* to the fifteen verses which begin with *śṛṅgārahāsyaka-*

[33] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śl.* 14, p. 266.

[34] These should be counted from the 15th to the 30th verse, leaving the unnumbered stanza and also the second stanza of the 28th and first stanza of the 29th verses. In the first edn. there are some additional matters here. Abhinava accepts some verses to be genuine but they are not so. The validity of all these things will be discussed later.

[35] '*atho'ddiṣṭānāṃ vibhāgaṃ sūcayati saṅgraho yo mayeti / tasyeti saṅgrahasya / saṅgraha eva vistārito vibhāga ityarthaḥ / kiṃ taduktāveva sarvaṃ sampannaṃ, netyāha saniruktaṃ parīkṣāparyanta mityarthaḥ, antavacane'vyayībhāvaḥ / na cālakṣitasya parīkṣetyāha sakārikaṃ kārikāsampadopetaṃ, sampattau samāsaḥ.*' A.B., Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 266.

ruṇā,[36] etc. And in adherence to this very view, he also interprets the half verse which follows these verses, where Bharata concludes the topic. According to Abhinava this half verse reads thus: '*eva meṣo'lapasūtrārtho nirdiṣṭo nāṭyasaṅgrahaḥ*'.[37] On this he comments: '*eta dupasaṃhara tyeva mityādinā*'. What he means by this would be clear from his next sentence meant as *avataraṇikā* to the next stanza, '*eva muddeśavibhāgabhedena dvidhā saṅgraha mabhidhāya lakṣaṇaparīkṣe vaktuṃ pratijānīte ataḥ para miti.*'[38] From this we get another point, that in his opinion the *saṅgraha* is of two kinds of which one is *uddeśa* and the other *vibhāga*.[39]

The next stanza to the one quoted above is followed by a long prose passage. If the first sentence of that prose passage and that stanza are to be quoted, these run as follows:

ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi sūtragranthavikalpanam
tatra rasāneva tāvadādā vabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ.[40]

While commenting on *sūtragranthavikalpanam*, he says[41] that the *sūtra* means definition (*lakṣaṇa*) which includes the *kārikā* too, i.e. *ānuvaṃśyas*, *grantha* means *bhāṣya* and *vikalpana* means the examination (*parīkṣā*), otherwise called *nirukta*, which finds its scope in the *bhāṣya*.

From the above remarks and also from another statement[42] of his it is evident that Abhinava does not think of *bhāṣya* and *parīkṣā* exactly as synonyms. If so, it goes against the implication,

36 '*tatra vibhāgaṃ tāva dāha śṛṅgārahāsyetyādinā, nāṭyasaṅgraha ityantena.*' Ibid.

37 *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śl.* 31, p. 271.

38 *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 271.

39 Here it should be noted that he gives the meaning *saṅgraha* to the compound word of this stanza, viz. *alpasūtrārtha*. This he says again in adherence to his interpretation of the compound word *alpasūtragranthārtha* of the verse, *kintvalpasūtragranthārtha* (Vol. I, p. 262), which in his opinion is meant for the definition of the *saṅgraha*. As the word *nāṭyasaṅgraha* is also used here, *alpasūtrārtha* should be taken as an adjective to this, but of course without any change of its meaning.

40 *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 271-2.

41 '*sūtragranthavikalpana miti / sūtraṃ sūtrakaṃ lakṣaṇaṃ vakṣyāmi / tenaiva ca kārikā saṅgṛhītā / grantho bhāṣyaṃ tatkṛtaṃ ca vikalpana mākṣepasamādhānātmaka miti parīkṣā niruktaśabdavācyā pratijñātā.*' *A.B.*, Vol. I, p. 271.

42 '*evaṃ sūtraṃ bhāṣyaṃ parīkṣāṃ ca pravakṣyāmi iti* pratijñāya . . . . . .' Ibid.

mentioned earlier, of his interpretation of *nirukta*. The conclusion we reached is that the words, *bhāṣya*, *grantha*, *nirukta* and *parīkṣā* are synonyms. Now we find him distinguishing the latter set of the words, *nirukta* and *parīkṣā*, alone to be synonyms, differing in meaning from that of the former two which stand as synonyms.

Of course he distinguishes them, but he does not consider them to be altogether different, i.e. entirely unconnected. If certain expressions of his are noted, viz., *sūtrabhaṣya(grantha)yor lakṣaṇaparīkṣayoḥ* (p. 263) and *sūtravivaraṇasvabhāvā tu kārikā . . . bhāṣyasya*[43] *paścā dasyāḥ pāṭhaḥ* etc. (p. 271) on the one hand and on the other *ākṣepasamādhānātmaka miti parīkṣā tat (bhāṣya) kṛtaṃ vikalpanam* (p. 271), the following conclusion would seem to be quite correct. *Bhāṣya* means an elaborate explanation of the subjects defined in the *sūtra*, i.e. *lakṣaṇavākya* or the subjects defined by *lakṣaṇa*, definition. Thus the *bhāṣya* is of a general nature whereas the examination (*parīkṣā*) is a part of it which is concerned more specifically or precisely with the matter of questions and their answers. This means that when the word *bhāṣya* is used one can derive, if necessary, also the meaning *parīkṣā* from it, but from *parīkṣā*, though it is a part of *bhāṣya*, one cannot take the meaning *bhāṣya*, as *parīkṣā* is meant to convey a particular thing alone. This conclusion explains properly the viewpoint of Abhinava with which he, commenting on the verse *kintvalpasūtragranthārtha*, declares the meaning *parīkṣā* to the word *bhāṣya*.

In this same place he clarifies the order of the presentation of these things, taking the prefix *abhi* of the usage *abhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. He says[44] that first of all the *sūtra*, then *bhāṣya* or *grantha*, and lastly *parīkṣā* will be presented. The question of the proper order for the *ānuvaṃsya* verses, which he calls also *kārikās*, is settled a few lines before this. To this problem he has to pay special attention, because of his interpretation of it as one of the two defining sentences. We have already noted that he answers, while commenting on the verse *alpābhidhānenārtho yaḥ* (Ch. 6, *Śl.* 11), the question

[43] *Ānuvaṃśya* verses are read in such places where difinite conclusions are reached after completing every kind of discussion, i.e. also such a discussion which Abhinava calls *parīkṣā*. So *bhāṣya* means *parīkṣā* also.

[44] '*abhitaḥ sūtragranthaparīkṣākrameṇa vibhajyākhyāsyāmaḥ*'. *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 271.

why this repetition, i.e. two defining sentences. There he says that the *ānuvaṃśya* verses are given as they would be a bit explicative to Bharata's *lakṣaṇa* and also helpful in grasping the things easily. In the present context too he expresses the same idea, but with additional and interesting points, without knowing which his viewpoint cannot be fully appreciated. He says[45] that the *kārikā*, i.e. *ānuvaṃśya* verses, which are explanatory in nature, elucidate to some extent the meaning of Bharata's *sūtra*. At the same time they help the pupils, perflexed with a long process of complicated discussion as conducted in the *bhāṣya*, through propounding the conclusions (*sthita* (*ra*) *pakṣa*) in a simple manner. It is due to their latter function that these will be read after the *bhāṣya*.

Thus explaining, he tackles the problem and shows the propriety of reading the *ānuvaṃśya* verses after *bhāṣya*. This explanation is important, for it is with this idea that he remarks *sukhasaṅgrahāya*, etc., in some places when in future he has to comment on matters related to the *ānuvaṃśya* verses. And the usages here and elsewhere, like *sūtravivaraṇasvabhāvā* are cleverly planned descriptions of *kārikā* meant to prepare us for his twists. This will be clear when we take up the words *ānuvaṃśya* and *nidarśana*.

To sum up this discussion: according to Abhinava these things will be arranged in the order — *sūtra*, *grantha* or *bhāṣya*, *parīkṣā* and *kārikā*, i.e. *ānuvaṃśya* verses.

Thus we have seen what kind of meanings Abhinava gives to the five words — *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. Now it would not be in vain or improper to try to see whether Abhinava himself is the first to give such meanings to them or whether he simply continues earlier explanations.

ABHINAVA'S INDEBTEDNESS TO HIS PREDECESSORS

It is quite certain that Abhinava gets most of these meanings, if not all, from earlier sources. This is obvious from the many statements that are to be found in the *Abhinava-bhāritī*. Unfortunately

[45] '*sūtravivaraṇasvabhāvā tu kārikā sūtra mapi prakāśayantī bahutarākṣepasamādhānavyākulaśiṣyajana* (*naṃ*) *sthita* (*ra*) *pakṣanirūpaṇenopakarotīti bhāṣyasya paścā dasyāḥ pāṭhaḥ*.' Ibid.

in these matters he does not mention any names, but always refers to them with *anye*, *kecit*, etc. At this late period there is no clue to determine whether or not these expressions, *anye* and *kecit*, can include the four well-known commentators, Udbhaṭa, Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka and Bhaṭṭanāyaka, and some other comparatively less popular authors, like Kīrtidhara, Bhaṭṭayantra, Bhaṭṭagopāla and Śrīharṣa, etc. As there is no definite evidence, we too cannot but mention them as *kecit*, some people.

Here certain passages, where there is a reference to such an interpretation of these words, are quoted, without entering into the details and touching the context:

1. '*tena vicchedasya parīkṣeyaṃ kathiteti*'[46]
2. '*anye tu nāṭyagatānāṃ rūpakādīnāṃ pāṭhyābhinayarasagītānāṃ ca kiṃ pramāṇaṃ kā saṅkhyeti vibhāgaviṣayo'yaṃ praśna ityācakṣate*'[47]
3. '*anyastvāha tisṛṣu prakṛtiṣu tryavastho vibhāvatāratamyād dvirūpaḥ puna rātmaparasthatvena dvi(vi)dheti dvādaśabhedo'ya miti kārikātātparya miti*'[48] and
4. '*atra keci dāhuḥ — praśnapañcaka matraivādhyāye tāvannirṇīyate uddeśasthityā tadvibhāgalakṣaṇaparīkṣāparāṇi cādhyāyāntarāṇīti*'[49]

From the former three of these four passages we get the reference to *parīkṣā*, *vibhāga* and *kārikā*, whereas from the last one we have *uddeśa*, its *vibhāga*, *lakṣaṇa* and *parīkṣā*. Although it is not clear from these passages how the predecessors of Abhinava explain further implications of these words, yet these are more than enough to prove that Abhinava gets a general and complete idea regarding these interpretations from his predecessors. Especially the last passage gives us an idea how a complete theory in the matter existed before Abhinava. However to note the point of difference between the view mentioned in the last passage and that of Abhinava, according to those (referred to as *kecit*) the five questions of the first Ch. are answered in that very Ch. and the other five questions of the sixth Ch. are quite independent ones as answer of which the rest of the chapters are written; whereas, Abhinava, in opposition

[46] Ibid., Vol. II, Ch. 17, p. 399. [47] Ibid., Vol. I, Ch. I, p. 7.
[48] Ibid., p. 317. [49] Ibid. p. 9.

to this, says that the former five questions are not answered in the first Ch. alone, but the whole work is meant for answering them. He further says, as we have previously seen, that the latter five questions are not independent, but are meant to resume certain matters raised in the third one of the former five. Thus we can notice a different approach in regard to the two sets of five questions. The virtues of this approach will be discussed afterwards.

APPLICATION OF THESE MEANINGS

It is now necessary to see how Abhinava shows the application of his meanings. As an *avataraṇikā* to the famous *rasa* definition, he says (1) '*evaṃ kramahetu mabhidhāya rasaviṣayaṃ lakṣaṇasūtra māha*',[50] which means defining sentence (lit. the sentence meant for definition, *lakṣaṇārthaṃ sūtram*, or sentence of definition, *lakṣaṇasya sūtram*). (2) '*Śṛṅgāraṃ lakṣayati tatretyādinojvalaveṣātmaka ityantena sūtreṇa.*'[51] Here it means the sentence. (3) '*Sūtre saṅkṣipya yadvibhāvādi nirūpitam.*'[52] Here too *sūtra* means the sentence. As an *avataraṇikā* to the questioning sentence he says (4) '*evaṃ sūtraṃ vyākhyāya lakṣaṇapadaṃ parīkṣitu mākṣipati*'[53], which means that after having explained the definition, Bharata is going to examine the word *rasa* which occurs in the defining sentence. (5) '*Etat sūtreṇa vyaktaṃ yallakṣyapadaṃ śṛṅgāraṃ nāmeti tadbhāṣyeṇa vyācaṣṭe yatkiñci dityādinā.*'[54] In the same topic he observes again (6) '*atha ratisthāyīti sūtrabhāgaṃ bhāṣyeṇa spaṣṭayati sacetyadinā.*'[55] In both places it means the definition. Thus from the former three

[50] Ibid., p. 272. [51] Ibid., p. 300. [52] Ibid., p. 303. [53] Ibid., p. 288.

[54] Ibid., p. 300. In the print this passage runs thus: '*etatsūtrabhāṣyeṇa vyaktaṃ yallakṣyapadaṃ nāmeti vyācaṣṭe yatkiñci dityādinā.*' It is obviously incorrect, because there is no portion of *bhāṣya* which precedes the sentence, *yatkiñcilloke śuci* etc., so only in the case of *bhāṣya's* precedence the word *sūtrabhāṣya* would be applicable, otherwise it is impossible to prove its correctness. Further, *nāmeti vyācaṣṭe yatkiñcidityādinā* makes no sense. Therefore, we have corrected it in the above way. Here *sūtra* means *lakṣaṇa* not *lakṣaṇavākya*, because he says *lakṣyapadam*, which means nothing but *śṛṅgāra*. It would be obvious when *lakṣaṇapadam* in the fourth sentence quoted above is noticed which means the word existing in the defining sentence. If *lakṣyapadam* is to mean *śṛṅgāra* itself, but not the word *śṛṅgāra*, then it would be better to give the meaning 'definition' to the word *sūtra*.

[55] Ibid., p. 302.

of the six quotations it is clear that he uses the word *sūtra* to mean the defining sentence, while from the rest of the three quotations it is obvious that he uses the same word to mean the definition itself.

The following observations of his are concerned with the *saṅgraha* or *saṅgraha* and its *vibhāga*: (1) '*eva muddiṣṭānāṃ vibhaktānāṃ ca rasānām*',[56] (2) '*tadetadāha dharmī yā dvividheti proktā uddiṣṭetyarthaḥ pūrva miti rasā bhāvā ityādisaṅgrahavibhāgāvasare*'.[57] He says, as seen already, that *saṅgraha* is of two kinds, viz. *uddeśa* and *uddeśa-vibhāga*. In these two quotations he observes in accordance with his conclusion.

Now we shall see how he illustrates the application of the words *bhāṣya* and *parīkṣā*. In the place where Bharata explains *rasa* with the help of analogy,[58] Abhinava writes the *avataraṇikā* as: '*atra praśne bhāṣyeṇa prativacana māha yathetyādināpnuvantītyantena*'. Here it seems that Abhinava thinks that this question (*ko dṛṣṭāntaḥ*) is concerned with the very problem, the possibility of expounding the *rasa*, but not anything mentioned in the *rasa* definition proper, or the defining sentence proper. It may be that with this view he considers this passage as an explanatory one, though it consists of a question and an answer as well. In fact, according to him, the passage consisting of questions and answers, is *parīkṣā* or *nirukta*. If we are not ready to understand his present use of *bhāṣya* in this light, we will have to understand that he uses the word *bhāṣya* here in a wider sense. If so, here the word, no doubt, means explanation.

Secondly, he writes the following *avataraṇikā* to the portion beginning with *atrāha—rasa iti kaḥ pathārthaḥ* as '*evaṃ sūtraṃ vyākhyāya lakṣaṇapadaṃ parīkṣitu mākṣipati rasa iti ka ityādinā*.'[59] Here he says that it is *parīkṣā*. Further, the noticeable thing is the

[56] Ibid., p. 294. [57] Ibid., Vol. II, p. 214.

[58] '*ko dṛṣṭāntaḥ / atrāha—yathāhi nānāvyañjanauṣadhidravyasaṃyogād rasaniṣpattir bhavati / yathāhi—guḍādibhir dravyair vyañjanauṣadhibhiś ca ṣāḍavādayo rasā nirvartante tathā nānābhāvopagatā api sthāyino bhāvā rasatva māpnuvanti*.' *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, pp. 288-9. This is according to the first edn. We have followed it here because the commentator used it. *See* pp. 287-8 for the same in the second edn.

[59] *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 288.

usage, *sūtrṃ vyākhyāya*. Here the word *vyākhyāna* does not simply give the general sense of commentary, but it means the *bhāṣya*. Then the total sentence gives the meaning that, after having completed *bhāṣya*, *parīkṣā* is conducted. Taking Bharata's sentence, *atrāha kiṃ rasebhyo bhāvānā mabhinirvṛtti rutāho bhāvebhyo rasānā miti*, he says: '*yadeta duktaṃ rasatattvaṃ tadevo'paśodhayitu mupakramate'trāhetyādinā codyamukhena.*'[60] Although here he does not use the word *parīkṣā* yet his word *pariśodhanā* may be taken as *parīkṣā*. In other places, too, usages like this may be taken, if the context permits, to mean *parīkṣā*.

In the *śṛṅgāra rasa* topic he observes that '*etatsūtreṇa vyaktaṃ yallakṣyapadaṃ śṛṅgāraṃ nāmeti tadbhāṣyeṇa vyācaṣṭe yatkiñcidityādinā.*'[61] This is said in order to clarify the nature of a passage in the *N.Ś.* that follows the definition of the *śṛṅgāra rasa*. No questions precede this passage, so on the basis of it, he says that this passage is meant for the explanation of what comes as a result of the definition, i.e. this is a *bhāṣya* on *śṛṅgāra*. Again in the same topic, he says: '*atha ratisthāyītisūtrabhāgaṃ bhāṣyeṇa spaṣṭayati sacetyādinā.*'[62] He says this to clarify the nature of Bharata's sentence: '*sa ca strīpuruṣahetuka uttamaprakṛtiḥ.*' In Abhinava's opinion the present sentence of Bharata is meant to explain the matter said in the definition, the matter conveyed through the phrase, *ratisthāyiprabhavaḥ*. That is why he calls it *bhāṣya*. Further, he says in the same topic: '*sūtre saṅkṣipya yadvibhāvādinirūpitaṃ tadvibhāgena vyākhyeya mityāśayena śṛṅgārasyāvasthābheda māha tasya dve ityādinā.*'[63] If there is no objection to ascribing the meaning *bhāṣya* to the word *vyākhyeyam*, this passage, too, can be taken to be similar to the above two sentences. Let us now proceed with his observations in the *śṛṅgāra* topic in regard to *parīkṣā*. Writing an *avataraṇikā* to Bharata's sentence: '*atrāha—yadyayaṃ ratiprabhavaḥ śṛṅgāraḥ katha masya karuṇāśrayiṇo bhāvā bhavanti*', Abhinava observes that '*vākyaikavākyatvenāvasthādvayasyūtasya śṛṅgārasya yatsvarūpa mukta meta deva pariśodhayituṃ pūrvapakṣayatyatrāheti.*'[64] Here the word *pariśodhanā* means nothing but *parīkṣā*. This would be clearer from his concluding remarks which run as: '*evaṃ parīkṣya parīkṣāphala*

[60] Ibid., p. 292. [61] Ibid., p. 300 (Also *see* footnote 54.). [62] Ibid., p. 302.
[63] Ibid., p. 303. [64] Ibid., p. 309.

mupasaṃharatyeva meṣa iti.'[65] Thus we have noticed his explanation as well as the way of application of these terms.

After the above sentence, as an *avataraṇikā* to the *ānuvaṃśya* verse, he goes on to say: '*evaṃ sūtrārthe parīkṣya sthāpite tadarthasya sukhagrahaṇārthaṃ sūtrārthavivaraṇarūpatvāt sūtrasamīpe'pyucitapāṭhāṃ kārikā madhunā paṭhatyapiceti / na kevalaṃ sūtraṃ parīkṣāpi, yāvadiyaṃ kāriketi samuccayārthaḥ / evaṃ sarvatra mantavyam.*'[66] The matter presented here is based on his interpretation of the *kārikā* and certain of his observations (*see* footnote 49). The matter said here will be discussed in detail later on. But for the present the fact to note about this passage is '*evaṃ sarvatra mantavyam*'. This is said not only in connection with *kārikā*, but is applicable to the *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *parīkṣā* as well as *kārikā*. This statement '*evaṃ sarvatra mantavyam*' means that in future throughout the text one will have to know the application of the words *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *parīkṣā* and *kārikā*, as well as their order in the manner shown in these two topics—general *rasa* and *śṛṅgāra-rasa* definitions. This can be definitely said, because after the *śṛṅgāra* definition is completed he never remarks anything about the application of these words, though he uses them on a few more occasions. One thing that needs clarification here is that twice or thrice he points out in the following text something new regarding *kārikā*, but such points are not concerned with the questions like the definition and placing, etc., which have been discussed before. Those things we shall deal with when we take up the word *ānuvaṃśya*. So far nothing essential in his statements connected with the illustration of his meanings of those words has been left unnoticed here.

If the matters recorded in the above quotations connected with the words *bhāṣya* and *parīkṣā* are understood well separately and ensemble, we can conclude as follows: (1) *Bhaṣya* means simply an explanation or clarification of the things said in the definition. (This is seen clearly from his previous discussions and also from his observations in the *rasa* definition. This becomes clearer in view of what he explains about certain matters related with the Bharata's sentences, *yatkiñcilloke śuci*, etc. and *sa ca strīpuruṣahetuka*, etc.) (2) *Parīkṣā* means examination of the things said in the

[65] Ibid., p. 311. [66] Ibid.

definition. The examination, whose characteristics are questions and answers (*ākṣepapratisamādhāna*), is meant for establishing beyond a doubt the matters said in the definition. In fact, both of these have finally the sole function, viz., the establishment of the things said in the definition. Yet their necessity arises from different demands. *Bhāṣya* fulfils the want of clarification arising from very brief statements. Here there is no scope for raising the questions about the tenability of the matters said in the definition. If there are any questions here, those would arise out of obscurity, or rather want of clarity. The necessity of *parīkṣā* comes after the understanding of the things said in the definition along with the explanation. The questions that arise now are of a challenging nature, i.e. they shake the basis of the certain explanations. Then comes the necessity to reply to them. The replay, too, is a factor in the *parīkṣā*. Thus the necessity of *bhāṣya* and *parīkṣā* arises in different conditions and they fulfil different demands. However both of them are to lead in the final stage towards the establishment of the matters said in *sūtra*. It is also clear from this discussion that *parīkṣā* follows *bhāṣya*, but never vice versa.

It is with this view that Abhinava specifies their order as: first of all *sūtra*; secondly, *bhāṣya*; thirdly, *parīkṣā*; and then lastly, *kārikā* or *ānuvaṃśyas*. If it is to be explained further, in Abhinava's opinion the prose passages of the *N.Ś.* generally consist of three parts, viz. *sūtra*, *bhāṣya* and *parīkṣā*.

Parīkṣā, as described, has less scope than *bhāṣya*. Therefore, in case of necessity, *bhāṣya* can include *parīkṣā* in it, but never can *parīkṣā* include *bhāṣya*. It is with this view that Abhinava explains *bhāṣya* (p. 263) as *parīkṣā* and also observes that '*grantho bhāṣyaṃ tatkṛtaṃ ca vikalpana mākṣepapratisamādhānātmaka miti parīkṣā*' (p. 271).

We have tried to see what meanings Abhinava finds for the five words, *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. We have also seen how he shows the application of such meanings. The two remaining terms — *ānuvaṃśya* and *nidarśana* can now be discussed separately.

ABHINAVA'S INTERPRETATION OF ĀNUVAṂŚYA

WHILE commenting on Bharata's first use of the word *ānuvaṃśya* (*atrānuvaṃśyau ślokau bhavataḥ*), Abhinava begins by observing thus: In this exposition (*bhāṣya*) there are two verses in *śloka* metre (i.e. *anuṣṭup* metre), the verses which are prevalent for generation after generation of teachers and students (i.e. tradition). These are called *kārikā*, since they help for an easy understanding of the matters briefly said in *sūtra* (i.e. defining sentence). To quote his sentences: '*atreti bhāṣye'nuvaṃśe bhavau śiṣyācāryaparaṃparāsu vartamānau ślokākhyau vṛttaviśeṣau sūtrārthasaṅkṣepa*prakaṭīkaraṇena kārikāśabda-vācyau bhavantau/tau paṭhati yathetyādi.*'[67] From this it is clear that Abhinava calls the very *ānuvaṃśya* verses as *kārikās*, and he also accepts these *kārikās* or *ānuvaṃśya* verses to be much older than Bharata. The latter point is further supported by his observation on the *bhayānaka-rasa* topic (which we shall quote later). Again in some other places he says '*evaṃ sūtrārthe parīkṣya sthāpite tadarthasya sukhagrahaṇārthaṃ sūtrārthasya vivaraṇarūpatvāt sūtrasamīpe'pyucita-pāṭhāṃ kārikā madhunā paṭhatyapiceti*'[68] and '*sūtrārthānuviddhe yāvadārye apītyapicetyasya bhinnakramasyārthaḥ*'.[69] From these quotations, and others given earlier, it is clear that Abhinava describes the *ānuvaṃśya* verses in accordance with his interpretation of one variety of *kārikās* and the similar observations made (see footnote 45). In his opinion these *ānuvaṃśya* verses give us the matters

[67] Ibid., p. 290. **Saṅkṣepa* should be taken in the light of his explanation of *kārikā* as *sūtravivaraṇasvabhāvā* (p. 271). If so, it does not mean here that *kārikā* gives the matters more briefly than *sūtra*, but being an adjective to *prakaṭīkaraṇa*, whose meaning is explanation, gives the meaning that the *kārikā* explains the *sūtrārtha* not elaborately, but briefly. Or in the light of his commentary on the verse meant to define the *kārikā*, such as "*tadvācakasya sūtrasya tatsaṅkṣiptārthavivaraṇātmakasya ca ślokasya*" (p. 264), it should be corrected.

[68] Ibid., p. 311. It may not be out of place to mention that a word used here, viz. *tadarthasya* does not mean that the *kārikā* includes also the matters said in *bhāṣya* and *parīkṣā*. Abhinava takes care not to commit such things. This is quite clear from his statement which we have quoted (*see* footnote 45) and from the other observations of his. He is always careful to suggest that the *kārikā* says the same matters said in *sūtra*, i.e. Bharata's defining sentence but along with a bit of explanation.

[69] Ibid., p. 312.

said in *sūtra* (i.e. Bharata's defining sentence) but along with a bit of explanation. In the first of the above quotations he touches the point of their order of placing and again mentions the argument already advanced (in the passage quoted in footnote 45).

Regarding these he observes further on the *bhayānaka-rasa* topic, '*bhaya mityabhineya miti vīra-rasa ityāryātaḥ sambadhyate/tā etā hyāryā ekapraghaṭṭakatayā pūrvācāryair lakṣaṇatvena paṭhitāḥ muninā tu sukhasaṅgrahāya yathāsthānaṃ niveśitāḥ.*'[70] Unless the context is explained, the reason for his statement will not be clear. He interprets *bhayānaka* to be of two varieties—*kṛtaka* and *svābhāvika*. In order to do that he divides the four *ānuvaṃśya* verses, quoted under the prose passage devoted to *bhayānaka-rasa*, into two parts the first part of which contains the word, *bhayam* as its subject and lacks the verb. Then in order to supply the verb, he remarks in the above manner. He brings the word from the last of the verses quoted under the prose passage devoted to *vīra-rasa* which is dealt with immediately before *bhayānaka-rasa*. In order to prove the correctness of this method he says that in fact all these *ānuvaṃśya* verses have been read by ancient teachers as definitions continuously without any division or break (*ekapraghaṭṭakatayā*) and that it is Bharata who makes a subjectwise division, arranging them in their proper places for easy and clear understanding (*sukhasaṅgrahāya*). One may here call to mind the traditional belief about the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini. It is said that Pāṇini originally read his whole *Aṣṭādhyāyī* as if it were one (i.e. *ekavākyatayā*), but not as it has been seen for a long time as a collection of thousands of independent aphorisms, and it is the later *ācāryas* who split it up into separate aphorisms. With this belief or something akin to it, Abhinava seems to state the above. Anyhow it is one of the noteworthy statements in this matter. But from their writings it does not seem that modern scholars, even those who have utilised this passage, have noted this important fact.

So far as the purpose of quoting *ānuvaṃśya* verses in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is concerned, Abhinava is of opinion that Bharata quotes these verses only for an easy and clear understanding of the matters already established in Bharata's *sūtras*, i.e. defining sentences. He says nothing else, but repeatedly says the same thing. To show this

[70] Ibid., p. 327.

no new quotations are needed, it is quite clear from his interpretation of *ānuvaṃśyas* as a kind of *kārikā* and from other observation (*see* footnote 45) and also from most of the passages quoted above in this context. In no time Abhinava admits, rather unfortunately, that Bharata quotes them in order to lend an authority to his own statements, however Abhinava himself verbally says that these are older than Bharata. He always and repearedly mentions *sukhagrahaṇārtham*. In the circumstances it would not be wrong to assume that Abhinava deliberately wants to rest the honour of highest and unprecedented authority on Bharata and it is with this view he purposely and carefully twists different usages in order not to give any occasion, even by chance, which might lessen Bharata's supreme authority.[71] It is with this view that he mentions them here and there

[71] In one place in the seventeenth Ch. Bharata uses *apica* and then reads a verse. Commenting on it Abhinava says '*eva mapi bhavatītyasa(ti sa?)marthitaṃ syāt, taddhi pūrvaprakrāntavastusamarthanena prayujyata iti muneḥ śailī / tasmāt pūrvoktasthānatrayasamarthanārtho'yaṃ ślokaḥ*'. A.B., Vol. II, Ch. 17, p. 388. Here careful observation is necessary, as these sentences may lead to a misunderstanding that Abhinava takes this verse to be *ānuvaṃśya* verse and comments thus. Really if he comments on it thus, thinking it to be *ānuvaṃśya*, then it may stand as a somewhat express statement that Bharata quotes *ānuvaṃśya* verses as an authority. Even if it is accepted for the sake of argument, *samarthana* does not strictly mean authority. In fact, Abhinava does not take this verse as *ānuvaṃśya*. This would be clear if his reason for making such a statement is understood. Abhinava mentions that by taking Bharata's usge *api* as an indication some people say that here in this verse a particular *kākusvara* is defined. Abhinava opposes their view and says that if *kākusvara* is born, it is born only from three *sthānas*, (*uraśśiraḥkaṇṭha*), but not from sixty-six *śrutis*. If it is also born from *śrutis*, it becomes music itself. Thus what he wants to say cannot be available from Bharata's short sentence in prose. Therefore to say this, Abhinava interprets that Bharata has added this verse of his own. This is Abhinava's idea in writing the whole of the above passage in general and also *muneḥ śailī*. The use *ayaṃ ślokaḥ* in the above passage cannot be strong evidence in determining the fact that Abhinava takes this verse to be *ānuvaṃśya*, because he uses the word *śloka* to mean just a verse written by Bharata and *ānuvaṃśya* verse as well. On the *roudra-rasa* topic he observes that "*bharatamuni stvekena ślokeno'pasaṃharati iti raudrarasa iti*' Ibid., Vol. I, p. 324. From this it is obvious that by this word, *śloka*, he means that that particular verse is written by Bharata. We shall give the examples for the latter in the note No. 72. So it is certain now that he does not consider the present verse to be *ānuvaṃśya*. Our conclusion is further supported by what he comments twice in *śṛṅgāra* topic on the word *apica* (pp. 311 and 312 these already quoted). If he thinks the

as *saṅgraha-śloka* and sometimes simply as *śloka* even.[72] Here *saṅgraha* may be taken to mean *samyagjñāna* or in the sense of *parikaraśloka*, as *parikaraślokas* are meant for easy and clear understanding.

This is all that Abhinava says concerning the word *ānuvaṃśya*. To sum up: *ānuvaṃśya* verses are those that were read by ancient *ācāryas* as the definitions of different things. These were prevalent among teachers and pupils generation after generation and these had come down to Bharata. Originally these verses were read continuously without any break (*ekapraghaṭṭakatayā*), and it is Bharata who divides and arranges them here and there according to necessity or facility. By name these are called *kārikās*, which being *jñaptisādhakas*, give us the same matters said briefly in Bharata's *sūtras* (i.e. defining sentences), but along with a bit of explanation. There is no purpose in Bharata's quoting them but the aid in easy and clear understanding (*sukhasaṅgraha*) of different matters.

present verse is *ānuvaṃśya* he should have commented here too in the same way as he does in the case of said instances. And if he is of the view that Bharata quotes *āṇuvaṃśya* verses to show an authority then he should have mentioned it either in the commentary of the verse which defines *kārikā* (Ch. 6, *Śl.* 11) or in the place where he describes the propriety of the order (p. 271) or else in the place where Bharata utilises *ānuvaṃśyas* for the first time using the word *ānuvaṃśya* (p. 290). All these places are quite important, if he does not mention in these places, it would be fantastic to think that he mentions a very important matter in an insignificant place, (this place is insignificant in view of the matters already discussed). It is more than certain that Abhinava does not consider this verse to be *ānuvaṃśya*. Therefore this present passage does not stand in the way of our above conclusion.

[72] (*i*) '*athetikartavyatāṃ nirūpayituṃ saṅgrahaślokenāha, nānābhinayeti*' A.B., Vol. I, p. 346.

(*ii*) '*mandrāpi kākuś cātra bhavatīti saṅgrahaśloke vakṣyate*' Ibid., Vol. II, p. 395.

(*iii*) '*bhāvaśabdaparyālocanayā caitadevopapannamiti ślokenāha*' Ibid., Vol. I, p. 292. and

(*iv*) '*atha vyutpattyantara mapi darśayituṃ prāktanīṃ ca vyutpattiṃ darśayitu māha ślokaś cātreti*' Ibid., p. 345. All these mean *ānuvaṃśya* verses. The question where he means by the word, *śloka ānuvaṃśya* verse and where he does not mean it and means just a verse written by Bharata, should be decided on the basis of the context.

ABHINAVA'S INTERPRETATION OF NIDARŚANA

So far as the word *nidarśana* goes, it is used several times in the *Natyaśāstra*. It occurs twice in the sixth and seventh Chs. alike and also in some of the other chapters. As the *N.Ś.* along with Abhinava's commentary have not yet appeared in print completely, it is not possible for us at present to show how Abhinava comments on it in different places. But as his commentary on the sixth Ch. is available, it is not altogether impossible to note his opinion. His observations on it in the sixth Ch. are neither insignificant nor negligible. Therefore by taking these into account his interpretation may be noted here.

After completing the definition of the *rasatva* (i.e. genesis of *rasa*), Bharata, using the word for the first time says in the sixth Ch. that '*tadeṣāṃ rasānā mutpatti-varṇa-daivata-nidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ.*'[73] Again after mentioning *utpatti*, *varṇa* and *daivatas* of *rasas*, Bharata uses it thus: '*eva meṣāṃ rasānā mutpatti-varṇa-daivatānyabhivyākhyātāni / idānīṃ vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṃyuktānāṃ lakṣaṇanidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ.*'[74] On both of these Abhinava comments. His opinion on it is clearer from his commentary on the latter usage of these, so it is better to see first what he has to say on it. He says[75] that *nidarśana* means individual definition. He reaches this conclusion in two ways. He takes the words *lakṣaṇa* and *nidarśana* together, i.e. as a compound word, giving the meaning 'individual' to the latter (*viśeṣa*=special, particular) and puts the meaning upon them together as 'individual definition' (*lakṣaṇaviśeṣa*). He takes the same words together when he gives the second explanation too. Here he says that in which (i.e. individual definitions, or *nidarśana* or *viśeṣalakṣaṇa*) the general definition is exemplified or illustrated (*nirdiśyate*, *yojyate*, *udāhriyate*).

[73] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 294. [74] Ibid., p. 299.

[75] '*atha viśeṣalakṣaṇāni vaktu māsūtrayatīdānī mityādinā / viśeṣalakṣaṇaṃ sajātīyād vyavacchedakaṃ / na vijātīyād vyavacchedaṃ vinā sajātīyatvaṃ / nacāsau sāmānyalakṣaṇaṃ vineti, tatpṛṣṭe viśeṣalakṣaṇa miti darśayituṃ sāmānyalakṣaṇa manuvadatyanubhāvetyādinā / lakṣaṇāni ca tāni nidarśanāni ca viśeṣātmakāni tena pratyekaṃ lakṣaṇaviśeṣā ucyanta ityarthaḥ / viśeṣalakṣaṇāni vā sāmānyalakṣaṇasya nidarśanāni, yeṣu sāmānyalakṣaṇaṃ nirdiśyate yojyate udāhriyate ca tadvinā tasyodāhartu maśakyatvāt*' *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, pp. 299-300.

Thus in both these ways he treats the meaning of the compound word, *lakṣaṇanidarśana* as 'individual definition'. But, when he offers two meanings of *nidarśana* at one place, viz. individual (*viśeṣa*) as well as individual definition, it is not clarified as to which of these meanings he prefers or to which of these he wants to stick to. Though he does not mention the meaning 'individual definition' in the very beginning, yet he prefers it. His first mention of a meaning does not indicate his preference, the case is rather vice versa. Unless one depends on a far-fetched meaning, it is not possible to put the meaning, 'individual' on the word *nidarśana*. Therefore it can be assumed now that it is for this reason that Abhinava is not satisfied with the first meaning and tries through some other means to get the desired meaning. In this way his preference for the meaning, 'individual definition' can be presumed. In fact, to draw this conclusion one need not depend upon any assumption and it would be easily deduced from his commentary[76] on Bharata's first passage, quoted above, where the word *nidarśana* alone is used without *lakṣaṇa* along with it. In this place he certainly states that

[76] '_vilakṣaṇādyevaṃ*nirdeśanaṃ tu śṛṅgāro nāmetyādinā vibhāvādiviśeṣasaṃyoga utpattilakṣaṇā*hyanyonyāśraya*śaṅkāvarṇadaivatayostvāgamānuviddhatvamiti sphuṭaṃ niścayadarśanopāyatva mutpattyādīnāṃ na sambhavati/vibhāvādiviśeṣasaṃyogastu tadvailakṣaṇyā nnidarśana mityuktam_' Ibid., 1st edn. p. 296. Apart from faulty punctuation here, three incorrect readings occur which are indicated by the asterisk on the above. In the 2nd edn. some amendations are made and they too do not seem correct. According to this edn. this passage runs as follows: '_varṇaśśvetādi tu (stu) suspaṣṭaṃ vi(śeṣa) lakṣaṇādi / evaṃ nidarśanaṃ tu śṛṅgāro nāmetyādinā vibhāvādiviśeṣasaṃyogaḥ / utpattilakṣaṇā(ṇe) hyanyonyāśrayaśaṅkā varṇadaivatayo stvāgamānuviddhatva miti sphuṭaṃ niścayadarśanopāyatva mutpattyādīnāṃ na sambhavati / vibhāvādiviśeṣasaṃyoga stu tadvailakṣaṇyā nnidarśana mityuktam_' p. 295. So we rewrite it with our amendations. _vilakṣaṇā deva nirdeśanaṃ tu śṛṅgāro nāmetyādinā / vibhāvādiviśeṣasaṃyoge utpattilakṣaṇayā anyonyāśrayatvānāśaṅkā / varṇadaivatayo stvāgamānuviddhatva miti sphuṭaṃ niścayadarśanopāyatva mutpattyādīnāṃ na sambhavati / vibhāvādiviśeṣasaṃyogastu tadvailakṣaṇyā nnidarśana mityuktam._ Our second amendation is based on what he says in the same context e.g. '_viśeṣalakṣaṇānśa-pūrakāṇyutpattyādīni vyākhyāsyāmḥ .. parasparalakṣaṇam_' pp. 294-5 and this amendation further proves to be correct when some other observation of his is noticed. This is as follows: '_tatra utpattilakṣaṇa manyonyāśrayatvān na niścayakāri / varṇadaivatātmaka mapyāgamasiddhatvā dityekapraghaṭṭakenopasaṃharatyeva mityādinā_'. Ibid., p. 299. The third one would automatically be acceptable, if the second is accepted on the grounds mentioned. The first one follows

the word *nidarśana* means individual definition. This is further supported by his *avataraṇikā* to Bharata's same sentence.[77] From the above discussion it is now quite certain that Abhinava takes the word *nidarśana* to mean individual definition.

In the preceding investigation we have seen, without leaving any important matter, what kind of meanings Abhinava attaches to the seven technical terms proposed for discussion in this book. It is with these meanings that Abhinava uses those words here and there,[78] so it is necessary to understand from those words the same meanings whenever they occur in *Abhinava-Bhāratī*.

To sum up:

1. *Sūtra* means definition (*lakṣaṇa*) and defining sentence (*lakṣaṇavākya*), too.
2. *Bhāṣya* means exposition, and the exposition, being wider in its scope, includes *parīkṣā* (*nirukta*, examination). For this reason, sometimes or in case of necessity it is also called *parīkṣā* or *parīkṣaṇa*. *Bhāṣya* has a synonym, viz. *grantha*. Sometimes it is also called *bhāṣyagrantha*.

the general sense, as *vilakṣaṇādyevam* does not seem to make any sense at all, then here the order of words according to the meaning would be *sṛṅgāretyādinā nirdeśanaṃ tu vilakṣaṇādeva*. Further it should be noted here that the above passage is written by him as an explanation of *nidarśana*, after explaining something about *utpatti* and *varṇa* (but he does not separately comment on *daivata*, except for a mere mention of it in the above quoted passage).

[77] '*viśeṣalakṣaṇaṃ vaktuṃ pīṭhabandhaṃ darśayati tadeṣā mityādinā*'. Ibid., p. 294.

[78] Take, for example, the word *parīkṣā*. He uses it even in the first Ch. itself with the meaning which he would give to it. As we have already suggested, this meaning was in vogue before Abhinava. May be with this reason he uses it freely in the first Ch. without remarking or pointing out anything about it which is necessary in case it was not in vogue. He says '*etaditi lakṣaṇaparīkṣāparyanta metat*'. Ibid., p. 8. In further places, too, he says: (1) '*tadeta dāha dharmī yā dvividheti / proktā uddiṣṭetyartaḥ / pūrva miti rasā bhāvā ityādisaṅgrahavibhāgāvasare*' (Ibid., Vol. II, p. 214.) (ii) '*pūrva miti ṣaṣṭhe'dhyāye sa nirūpyate*' (Ibid., p. 220.) (iii) '*teṣāṃ tu pṛthaguddeśaprayojanaṃ ṣaṣṭhe darśita mantarālāpaparigraha miti*' (Ibid., p. 391) and so on. Once he says '*uddeśagrantha eva kecillayā virāmāś cetyabhidhīyante*'. Ibid., p. 398. Here it is clear that he does not use the word *uddeśa* with the meaning *saṅgraha* of the sixth Ch. but he means the *uddeśa* of that particular context. If the localised references are left, there is no doubt he always uses those words to mean the things as we have concluded.

3. *Saṅgraha* means *uddeśa* (mere enumeration of the subjects to be dealt with). Also the *uddeśa-vibhāga* (the division of the *uddeśa*, i.e. the division of the subjects mentioned in *uddeśa*) is called *saṅgraha*. Thus *saṅgraha* is of two kinds *uddeśa* and *uddeśavibhāga*.
4. *Kārikā* originally means *lakṣaṇa*, the definition and defining sentence also is attributively called *kārikā*. The defining sentence is of two kinds:-
   (A) Bharata's defining sentence and
   (B) the *ānuvaṃśya* verses which Bharata quotes in his text, taking from earlier works. In this way *kārikās* are two in number. Thus the defining literature is of two kinds. The difference between them is that the former is very short and concerned purely with the definition. The latter also does the same, but it explains the former to some extent; thus it is of an explanatory nature. It helps the students who are confused with the various discussions in grasping the final conclusions (*sthirapakṣa*) easily (*sukhasaṅgraha*).
5. *Nirukta* is *parīkṣā*, i.e. examination. It may lead to the explanation, but it cannot be the explanation. That is why exposition (*bhāṣya*) can include the examination. Exposition need not necessarily arise from questions. Even if there are questions raised in exposition, they would not be concerned with the tenability of things said in the definition. Whereas in the *parīkṣā* questions are eseential features and they appear to shake the tenability of the matters said in the definition. As the answers follow the questions, they also sould be a feature of the *parīkṣā*. Thus it distinguishes itself from *bhāṣya* though it is in one sense included in *bhāṣya*. Next to all this Abhinava determines the order in which they should properly follow. He says that the *sūtra* comes first, then following it *bhāṣya*, and then finding its source in the latter (*bhāṣyakṛtam*) *parīkṣā*. Lastly, in accordance with its nature, *kārikā*, i.e. *ānuvaṃśya*, comes after these three.
6. *Ānuvaṃśya* is an adjective to either the word *śloka* or *āryā*. Taken together these *ānuvaṃśya śloka* or *ānuvaṃśya āryā*, i.e. *ānuvaṃśya* verses, mean the verses that were read by ancient *ācāryas* as definitions of different things and have been

prevalent among the teachers and pupils for ages. The same verses are called *kārikās*, as they help in an easy grasping of the subjects dealt with (*jñaptisādhaka*). The purpose of Bharata's quoting them in his text is nothing but to aid in easy and clear understanding.

7. *Nidarśana* means individual definition.

EARLIER VIEWS

In the absense of any other commentary on the *Nāṭyaśāstra* or any other work written with the intention of explaining its contents, it is not possible to reach any definite conclusions regarding the prevailing views on the meanings of these seven words immediatly preceding Abhinava and earlier, i.e. before *Vārtikakāra*, Śrīharṣa. Nevertheless, though in a fragmentary form, certain views may be noted from the *Abhinava-Bhāratī*. These views, traceable from the *A.B.*, are but four: in the case of two of the four no name is mentioned, except in general terms, *kecit* and *anye*, whereas the remaining two are said to be expressed by the well-known commentators Bhaṭṭodbhaṭa and Bhaṭṭalollaṭa respectively.

Once in the first Ch. Abhinava says that '*atra keci dāhuḥ praśna-pañcaka matraivādhyāye tāva nnirṇīyate uddeśasthityā tāvadvibhāgala-kṣaṇaparīkṣāparāṇi cādhyāyāntarāṇi*', and '*anye tvāhuḥ pañcabhi radhyāyaiḥ pūrvaraṅgavidhānaparyantaiḥ praśnadvayaṃ nirṇītaṃ sāmānyābhinaya-citrābhinayāntaiś śiṣṭai stu praśnatraya miti*'.[79] From this it is clear that 'some people' belonging to a given school accept and mention *uddeśa*, *tadvibhāga*, *lakṣaṇa* and *parīkṣā*, all of which are acceptable to Abhinava, too. But a difference comes in in one respect. 'Some people' hold that the five questions raised in the first Ch. (*see* footnote 2) are answered in that very Ch., and the rest of the Chs. only enumerate, divide, define and examine the subjects (mentioned in the *uddeśa*). This virtually means accepting the independent status of the other set of five questions written in the beginning of the sixth Ch. On this point Abhinava completely differs from them. His reasons for this we have already noted. Another serious difference that he has with them is that he never admits that the five questions of the first Ch. are answered in that Ch. itself. On the

[79] *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 1, p. 9.

contrary, he firmly holds that all the succeeding Chs. are devoted to a clarification of these points. Thus there is an area of agreement as well as disagreement between Abhinava and '*kecit*' (some people) mentioned by him. So far as the adjustment of the five questions of the first Ch. goes, '*kecit*' are, without any doubt, correct. So far as the rest of the matters are concerned, they go along with Abhinava's views. Apart from these there are 'some other people' belonging to an another given school, who hold that two questions of the five of the first Ch. are answered in the first five Chs. while the rest of the three questions are answered in the Chs. from the sixth to the *Citrābhinaya* Ch. Why they say so, Abhinava records no argument of theirs. But for us it seems groundless, particularly because they omit those Chs. succeeding that of *Citrābhinaya*; and for this there is in fact no reason. As the people of this school agree that from the third question onwards all the rest are answered from the sixth Ch., we deduce, ignoring the question whether they mean it or not, that the set of five questions posed in the beginning of the sixth Ch. have no independent status in their view, too, as in Abhinava's view. In this point there may be an agreement between them and Abhinava. Still Abhinava dismisses them, too, with the same stroke with which he does in case of the former, because basically he cannot agree in the matter that all these five questions are answered in given places.

THE VIEW EXPRESSED BY THE AUDBHAṬAS

ABHINAVA incidentally mentions the view expressed by the Audbhaṭas (i.e. Udbhaṭa, known as the earliest commentator on the *N.Ś.*, and his followers) and also Lollaṭa's view directed against the Audbhaṭas.[80] The controversy between the Audbhaṭas and Lollaṭa

[80] '*rasā bhāvā hyabhinayā dharmīvṛttipravṛttayaḥ / siddhis svarā stathātodyaṃ gānaṃ raṅgaśca saṅgrahaḥ*' // N.Ś., Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 263. Commenting on this verse the Audbhaṭas and Lollaṭa differ on the subjects that should be included in the *saṅgraha*. This is the reason for Abhinava's mentioning their controversy under this verse. Abhinava notes it in the following lines:

'*abhinayatrayaṃ gītātodye ceti pañcāṅgaṃ nāṭyam / naṭasya hi rasabhāvayoge maraṇādau tattvāveśo layādibhaṅga śca syāt / dṛṣṭa stu tatpratyayo naṭe bhramaḥ / anena tu ślokena kohalamate ekādaśāṅgatva mucyate, na tu bharate, tatsaṅgṛhīta-syāpi puna ratroddeśāt, nirdeśe caitatkrama-vyatyāsanā dityaudbhaṭāḥ / naita diti*

centres on the problem as to what subjects are legitimately to be included in *saṅgraha*.

On this the Audbhaṭas say: *nāṭya* is a composite of five elements (limbs, *aṅga*), namely three *abhinayas* (i.e. *vācika, āṅgika* and *sāttvika*), *gīta* (song), and lastly, *ātodya* (the play of the four varieties of instruments). If *rasas* and *bhāvas* are also included among the *aṅgas* (limbs) of *nāṭya*,[81] then one would have to admit that the *naṭa* feels truly, or rather personally, what he presents on the stage (i.e. *maraṇa* or some other *bhāva*). In case the *naṭa* feels the different *bhāvas* as though they belong to him personally, then he fails to maintain or follow the tempo and the other things which are indispensable for dramatic performance. Our knowledge of *naṭa* to have really all the things he represents is an illusion. That is why *rasa, bhāva*, etc., except the five mentioned by us (Audbhaṭas), cannot be included in the *saṅgraha*. The description of *nāṭya* in this verse, as consisting of eleven *aṅgas* (limbs), is according to Kohala but not in accordance with Bharata. This is not Bharata's theory, firstly, because the same things again appear here, what Bharata has already covered or enumerated (probably they mean that these are covered in the first Ch. in the verses like *nāṭyavedaḥ kathaṃ brahman* and *jagrāha pāṭhya mṛgvedāt* etc.), and secondly, the different subjects are not dealt with in the future in the same order, i.e. the order in which these subjects are enumerated in this verse.[82]

*bhaṭṭalollaṭaḥ / rasabhāvānā mapi bhāvanā***veśavaśena naṭe sambhavāt, anusandhibalācca layādyanusaraṇāt, antarbhūtasyāpi prayojanavaśena punaruddeśadarśanāt, kramasya cāvivakṣitatvā diti*'. *This is a variant noted, and in fact it is correct because there is a word, *āveśa*, along with it, so it is adopted by us. The Audbhaṭas' view, '*abhinayatrayaṃ gītātodyeceti pañcāṅgaṃ nāṭyam*' etc. is attributed to Abhinava by S.K. De (see *H.S.P.*, Vol. I, pp. 25-6).

[81] This is the implied meaning of the sentence '*naṭasya rasabhāvayoge*', etc. This will be clear from Lollaṭa's answers to this. And in case it does not mean so, then no meaning can be made out of this sentence.

[82] Although some people, like Śārṅgadeva, verbally mention it, yet it is, in the opinion of some, a doubtful thing that Udbhaṭa wrote a commentary on the *N.Ś.* Especially in the *rasa* Ch., Abhinava quotes from Lollaṭa, Śaṅkuka and Bhaṭṭanāyaka, and vehimently criticises them too, but in such an important place he mentions neither Udbhaṭa nor the Audbhaṭas. This fact also may indirectly lead one to believe the above view. But Abhinava's present quotation or presentation of the Audbhaṭas' view disproves the above belief. In addition to this, Abhinava further speaks of (Ch. 9, *Śl.* 181, Vol. II, p. 70) '*pañca pracārā*

LOLLAṬA'S OPPOSITION TO THE AUDBHAṬAS

BHATTALOLLATA, one of the well-known commentators on the *N.Ś.*, opposes Udbhaṭa and his followers in this matter, directing three arguments against those advanced for their assumption. (i) We cannot prohibit the *naṭa* from relishing *rasa* and *bhāvas*; he may relish them through his power of imagination (*bhāvanāveśa*) and even if he relishes them, he can manage very well with tempo and other things through his power of concentration; so, there is no question of a danger that the *naṭa* would fail to manage the performance if he relishes *rasas* and *bhāvas.* (ii) One can, in case of need, mention or enumerate the subjects again, although they might have been already enumerated. (iii) The order of the enumeration of the subjects need not be taken to be followed seriously. Hence the Audbhaṭas' assumption that the present *saṅgraha* is one that represents the theory of Kohala, but not that of Bharata, cannot be accepted.

THE COMMON FACTOR AMONG THESE OPPOSING AUTHORS

THUS, Lollaṭa dismisses the Audbhaṭas' assumption. On this Abhinava says nothing in this place, except that he will explain the truth in the future (*vayaṃ tvatra tattva magre vitaniṣyāma ityāstāṃ tāvat*). Again, he does not touch this matter until the beginning of the thirteenth Ch., where *kakṣyā* and other things are dealt with.[83] As the matters discussed in that place will help us in no way in our purpose, we need not touch on them here.

hastasyeti Bhaṭṭodbhaṭaḥ paṭhati'. This, too, might have strongly disproved it if there were no varient reading Lollaṭa in the place of Udbhaṭa. In the ancient days, persons who did not write a commetary or similar works of exposition generally did not speak anything in places like the above. Basing on the general practice we may conclude that Udbhaṭa wrote a commentary or commentary-like work on the *N.Ś.* Apart from it, there must be some written material to be followed by some people, otherwise they cannot be called Audbhaṭas. This too can be taken as a proof of the fact that Udbhaṭa wrote a commentary on the *N.Ś.*

[83] *A.B.*, Vol. II, pp. 196-7.

In one sense or the other, all the opinions expressed by these earlier commentators are highly interesting, but detailed discussion on the problems raised by these views does not turn out to be of much use to us. One fact should not, however, be missed. From one of the Audbhaṭas' expressions, '*tad* (Bharata) *saṅgṛhītasyāpi puna ratroddeśāt*', and from Lollaṭa's counter-argument, '*antarbhūta-syāpi prayojanavaśena puna rtroddeśadarśanāt*', it is clear that these two commentators also think that with regard to certain subjects there is a repetition in the beginning of the sixth Ch. It has already been shown that Abhinava does not accept the independent status of the set of five questions in the sixth Ch., thinking that to do so would imply repetition. Although the Audbhaṭas and Lollaṭa on the one hand and Abhinava on the other recognise the repetition and try to avoid it by their interpretation, yet there is no scope for us to know to what extent they are in agreement in regard to the nature of the repetition. It does, however, give a clue to the trend prevailing among the commentators earlier than Abhinava. If this trend is to be traced on the basis of available material, it would go back to the time of Udbhaṭa, i.e. the eighth century A.D.

So far as the interpretation of the seven words is concerned, Abhinava neither mentions nor criticises diverging opinions. From this fact it is not possible to conclude that there existed no other or diverging interpretations. All that we may surmise is that these differences may not have been serious. Even then there is no reason to assume that Abhinava simply and wholly repeats what he has learnt from ealier people. On the contrary, there is evidence that everybody tackles these matters in his own way.[84] Whatever may be the merit of Abhinava, it is certain that in the main the interpretation of these words, as found in his commentary, is not entirely his, nor is it a new thing.

Thus we have noted Abhinava's interpretation as well as the views of earlier writers about certain things. So far as interpretations earlier than that of Abhinava go, it is not possible to examine them in detail, and so far as we know of them they are not acceptable. Abhinava's interpretation, therefore, may now be examined.

[84] Ibid.

CRITICISM OF ABHINAVA'S INTERPRETATION

(1) ABHINAVA'S very starting point is defective. He thinks that there is no need for two sets of questions regarding *nāṭya*, that to accept the independent status of the two sets of questions would lead to mere repetition. With this view he tries to twist the five questions of the sixth Ch. and to confine them to *rasa* and *bhāvas* only. But there does not seem to be much truth in that. Although the two sets of questions are concerned with *nāṭya* alone, their purpose is quite different. The set of five questions of the first Ch. is concerned with the general nature of *nāṭya*. There is none among them which is posed in order to seek the explanation of any specific thing or any detail connected with *nāṭya*. Even questions like how is *nāṭya* born and for whom is it meant ('*nāṭyavedaḥ katham brahmannutpannaḥ kasya vā kṛte*') are concerned with the general nature of *nāṭya*. All these questions are in fact answered in the first Ch. itself, as *kecit* (some people), whom he criticises without reasonable grounds, think. This has already been discussed by us. In several places in the first Ch. itself Abhinava declares against a number of views, that the whole work is devoted to answer these five questions and these are not completely answered in the first Ch. It is not possible for us to enter into such details here, but there is nothing convincing in his arguments. It is because of his unnecessary steadfastness in this matter that he has to interpret the set of five questions of the sixth Ch. in such an absurd fashion.

The set of five questions of the sixth Ch. is concerned with specific things, i.e. the requirements of *nāṭya*, unlike the questions of the first Ch., which are concerned only with the general nature of it. This will be obvious from the fact that no proper subject-matter of *nāṭya* is actually, rather theoretically, started before the sixth Ch., although *raṅga* is explained in the second Ch. itself. We shall later express our views about the reason for dealing with *raṅga* in the second Ch. For practical purposes let us assume for the present that *raṅga* is explained there because of the legend connected with *nāṭya*. Therefore it is quite correct to consider that no proper subject-matter of *nāṭya* is started before the sixth Ch. This can be said at least theoretically. If the five questions of the first Ch. are

concerned with the general nature of *nāṭya* and answered in the first Ch. itself, and the *pūrva-raṅga* and legend connected with *nāṭya* are also completed by the end of the fifth Ch., then there is a need and scope in the beginning of the sixth Ch. for a set of questions which are strictly concerned with the specific things of *nāṭya*. The verses at the end of the fifth Ch., and in the beginning of the sixth Ch. obviously indicate this. To meet with this new necessity another set of five questions is mentioned in the beginning of the sixth Ch. Thus, Abhinava's specification of these five questions is not acceptable. In fact, each of these is devoted to the *rasa*, *bhāva*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. This will be clear from our explanation that will follow. Thus those two sets of questions serve different purposes. They are for that reason separate sets of questions, though they are concerned with one thing alone, viz. *nāṭya*. Neither do the two depend, even slightly, upon the other, nor are they interdependent. Therefore, Abhinava's assumption that the acceptance of the two sets of questions regarding *nāṭya* leads to repetition will not hold water. Naturally any interpretation based on such an assumption is bound to prove incorrect.

(2) So far as the specification of the five questions of the sixth Ch. goes, Abhinava says that one is devoted to *rasa* while the four are devoted to *bhāva*. Leaving aside the propriety of such a specification, the words used by Bharata do not at all support such a view. It is not ancient practice to state important things like questions through using particles like *vā*, *ca* and *api*. But Abhinava gets the meanings he wants from them. It is impossible to state what Abhinava says in this place unless one is determined to read such things in the particles. So no further argument is required to refute this unsound view.

(3) It is true that Bharata shows two kinds of derivation for the word *bhāva*, as *bhavantīti bhāvāḥ bhāvayantīti bhāvāḥ*, but that does not mean that both of them are equally acceptable to him. Although Bharata does not refute the former literally, yet nowhere does he explain or utilise it. He explains the latter at length and utilises it whenever there is a need for it. Moreover, in no place in the *ānuvaṃśya* verses is the former mentioned, which is evidence enough of Bharata's unwillingness to accept the former derivation, '*bhavantīti bhāvāḥ*'. But Abhinava, basing himself on the fact that Bharata

does not mention this point literally, interprets it in the beginning of the seventh[85] Ch. as if it is not inacceptable to Bharata. Here he drags its meaning in order to identify it with the meaning of this latter derivation as '*kiṃ bhavanti bhāvayanti vā, bhavanti cet ki metat kurvanti vyāpnuvanti vā*' (p. 343). This does not seem correct, as it does not follow the idea of Bharata. If his very point that Bharata accepts two derivations is incorrect, then there is no possibility at all for him to bring out the four questions regarding *bhāva* that lie hidden, as he thinks, in the particles. Therefore Abhinava's theory that four questions out of the five are devoted to *bhāva* alone cannot but be rejected.

(4) After interpreting that these five questions are to be confined to *rasa* and *bhāvas*, Abhinava finds no legitimate reason for Bharata's mention of *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta* immediately after them in a stanza, *saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ caiva tattvataḥ*, so that he breaks *tattvataḥ*, as explained earlier, into three words, *tat*, *tu* and *ataḥ*, and says that those five questions cannot be answered without the *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. It is for this reason, he says, that it is necessary to explain them too. Thus Abhinava tries to see and show some reasons for their mention in this context. It is quite obvious how this meaning is attained through scholastic screwing. None can say that it is impossible according to the rules of *sandhi* to break *tattvataḥ* into three words, but everyone can feel what a wayward method and meaning has been employed to attain his end. Even if this interpretation is somehow accepted, it cannot be a proper reason which can explain the necessity of mentioning those three things. If *rasa* and *bhāvas* cannot be explained without using *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*, then these three things must be so said that they must be confined to *rasas* and *bhāvas* alone. Why then should Bharata include a number of other things too, like *abhinaya*, *dharmī*, *vṛtti*, etc., in the present *saṅgraha*? Why should Bharata quote *kārikā*, (i.e. *ānuvaṃśyas* according to Abhinava) also in some places other than *rasas* and *bhāvas?* And why does Bharata use *nirukta* (i.e. *parīkṣā* according to Abhinava) in places other than *rasas* and *bhāvas*? Abhinava's interpretation can provide no answer to these questions. Bharata's mention of other subjects along with *rasa* and

[85] Ibid., Vol. I, Ch. 7, pp. 342-6; especially *see* p. 343.

bhāva in *saṅgraha* definitely proves that these five questions are not concerned with *rasas* and *bhāvas* alone, and it is the same with the *kārikā* and *nirukta*. Therefore Abhinava's explanation of Bharata's mentioning those three—*saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*—here is not correct.

(5) As has been explained, Abhinava takes the verse, *kintvalpasūtragranthārthaṃ* etc., instead of the verse that follows it, viz. *vistareṇopadiṣṭānāṃ* etc. to be one that is devoted to define the *saṅgraha*. But it is without doubt a gross mistake. This particular verse is indeed concerned with *saṅgraha*, yet it is not meant to define it. It is meant for a somewhat general description of it which provides an understanding of its nature, purpose and also its necessity in given circumstances. This is quite clear from the context itself and particularly from Bharata's use of the word *kintu* in the beginning of the former verse. Abhinava does not consider this usage, or rather fails to note its significance. In fact, Bharata intends to define *saṅgraha* in the verse, *vistareṇopadiṣṭānām*, etc. Abhinava, on the contrary, says that Bharata wants to show in it some other people's opinion or acceptance. This is not correct, because Bharata in no way indicates it. Abhinava does not mention at all on what basis he comes to such a conclusion. We have suggested before that it might be on the basis of the usages *pravakṣyāmi* and *vidur budhāḥ*, as seen respectively in the former and latter verses. Even if our suggestion is not fully true, still it would be fantastic on the part of Abhinava to draw any such conclusion on the basis of a word like *budhāḥ*, for it is used in a very general sense, especially in places like this, i.e. without aiming with it a definite and specific meaning or idea. Therefore Abhinava's opinion that Bharata defines *saṅgraha* in the verse, *kintvalpasūtra-granthārtha*, etc., itself while presenting the others' acceptance of it in the verse, *vistareṇopadiṣṭānām* etc., is not acceptable.

(6) Even if, for the sake of argument, his opinion about the above matter is accepted, the meaning he puts to the compound word *alpasūtragranthārtham* creates difficulties. Certainly the meanings *lakṣaṇa* (definition) and *parīkṣaṇa* (examination) given to the words *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* respectively, are not convincing.

(7) Abhinava's interpretation of *kārikā*, too, is inacceptable, for it is not the one meant by Bharata. If Bharata thinks it to be

originally the definition itself, he could not have dealt with *lakṣaṇa-vākyas*, which are attributively called so, without dealing with the question of *lakṣaṇa*. Further, there is no reason for giving two varieties of *lakṣaṇa-vākyas*. In this connection we have found Abhinava talking of a second variety of *kārikā*, i.e. *ānuvaṃśyas*, as explanatory. But it is unsound, as we could find no additional material in any of the *ānuvaṃśyas*, and it is far from explaining Bharata's *sūtras*, i.e. *lakṣaṇa* written by Bharata. If Bharata intends to call *ānuvaṃśyas* as *kārikā* there is no need to mention the earlier verses, wherever quoted, as *ānuvaṃśya*. It cannot be argued that *ānuvaṃśya* is used as a synonym, in that case one would have to show an instance where the older verses are also called *kārikās*. Nowhere in the whole of the *N.Ś.* is the word *kārikā* used to indicate *ānuvaṃśya* verses. To say that *ānuvaṃśyas* will explain Bharata's *sūtras* is quite meaningless for Abhinava, who accepts the *ānuvaṃśyas* to be earlier than Bharata. Yet, as we have pointed out, he seems to say all this, because of two factors—firstly, he believes that Bharata's importance as supreme authority would be reduced if an authority earlier than Bharata is accepted, and secondly, he was under the strong influence of a later explanation of *kārikā* as something where the subject-matter is briefly discussed. These are the factors that lead him to such meanings. Therefore his is not the interpretation that could explain the real meaning that Bharata wants to convey by *kārikā*.

(8) The meanings he gives to the words, especially *arthasūcakaḥ*, in the definition of *nirukta* (p. 264), are such as can only be attained by a considerable effort. This is so obvious that one need not go into details.

(9) According to Abhinava *nirukta* is a part of *bhāṣya*, yet this is (or is at least considered to be) different from *bhāṣya* and the word *bhāṣya* can also in certain contexts, or in case of necessity, mean *nirukta* or be inclusive of *nirukta*, because, being wider in its scope, it can cover *nirukta*. But the case would never be vice versa. This is the conclusion that we have reached after considering everything said by Abhinava in this regard. An interpretation such as Abhinava's would prove to be inadequate and improper. In Bharata's text *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*, or *sūtra*, or *grantha* are used together. Abhinava says *sūtra* means *lakṣaṇa*, and also *lakṣaṇa-vākya*. He further adds

that the latter is called *kārikā*. *Kārikā*, he says, is described in a verse (Ch. 6, *Śl.* 11). This means, in one sense or the other, that the *sūtra* is defined in the *N.Ś.* Also *nirukta*, which is a part of *bhāṣya*, is, according to him, defined in the *N.Ś.* (Ch. 6, *Śls.* 12-3). On the basis of this interpretation we can naturally expect that he would show where *bhāṣya* is defined. But nowhere does he attempt to do so. Leaving aside the question of *sūtra*, even if we think of only *bhāṣya* and *nirukta*, his interpretation cannot be supported because he does not show where the definition of *bhāṣya* is given while showing the definition of its part, viz. *nirukta*, and also the definition of the *sūtra* which, according to Abhinava, is read by Bharata along with it. This proves that not only is his interpretation of these words wrong, but also his approach as a whole.

(10) Nowhere is any mention or hint given by Bharata of the fact that he intended to provide for two kinds of *uddeśa*, viz. *uddeśa* and its *vibhāga*, as Abhinava interprets it. Abhinava sees these things in the fourteenth verse of the sixth Ch. where, according to him, Bharata says that he is going to mention the *vibhāga* of *saṅgraha*. Abhinava finds some problem in Bharata's use of *saniruktaṃ sakārikaṃ*. But he tries to overcome it, saying that mere *vibhāga* would lead nowhere, so it is being said uptill its *parīkṣā* and *kārikā*. This explanation is nothing but a patchwork. One of Bharata's statements throws some light on this matter and it is as follows: '*ahaṃ vaḥ kathayiṣyāmi nikhilena tapodhanāḥ / saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ ca yathākramam.*'[86] If Bharata had any intention of calling *uddeśa-vibhāga* also as *saṅgraha* (as interpreted by Abhinava), he must have mentioned it in the above verse or somewhere near it. But we find no such mention anywhere. Therefore Abhinava's interpretation of the fourteenth verse of the sixth Ch. is not acceptable.

(11) Abhinava fixes *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *parīkṣā* and *kārikā* (*ānuvaṃśya*) to follow in the same order as mentioned here. In fact, we find that in the *N.Ś.*, especially in the seventh Ch., there are a number of things where there is no *bhāṣya*, no *parīkṣā*, and we find only (if Abhinava's terminology is followed) *sūtra* and *kārikā* (i.e. *ānuvaṃśyas*). In such places we can arrive at no true explanation by accepting Abhinava's

[86] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śl.* 5, p. 262.

terminology and the order of things determined by him is baseless, as the very things do not exist at all.

(12) Abhinava says that *nidarśana* means individual definition, but this meaning is a farfetched one. This word occurs in the sixth and seventh Chs., twice in each case. If it means individual definition there is no necessity to use it twice in the sixth Ch. This will be clear from our explanation. Therefore this is also not acceptable.

(13) So far as Abhinava's views on the word *ānuvaṃśya* goes, they are partly acceptable. He admits that those verses have been in practice among the teachers and pupils before Bharata, which is quite true and for this reason acceptable. He further thinks that all those *ānuvaṃśya* verses were originally read without any division (*ekapraghaṭṭakatayā*). It is not known from any source whether this view is prior to Abhinava or he himself is responsible for it. To decide this point one has to wait until some evidence is found. But it cannot be believed on the basis of Abhinava's statement only, because from the context in which he mentions this point, it seems that he says it in order to be able to interpret *Bhayānakarasa* in his own way.

But the most questionable part of his view here is about the purpose of *ānuvaṃśya* verses. He always says that these help the pupil in easily grasping the subjects, and secondly, that though these define different things as Bharata's defining *sūtras* do, yet they also explain a bit the things said in the latter. Both these explanations are intended to save Abhinava's theory somehow or other from damage, viz. repetition of definition. If we look into *ānuvaṃśyas* and what he calls Bharata's *sūtras*, we can hardly find *ānuvaṃśya* verses explaining or elaborating the meanings expounded in the so-called *sūtras*. Nor does he point out on any occasion where the *ānuvaṃśya* explains the *sūtra*.

Apart from these there can be other points raised against his views, such as the particular meanings given by him to certain words used in the contexts concerned with the seven technical terms. But all such matters would be minor and we need not enter into details, as these will not help in understanding Bharata's idea, or rather they will clearly appear to be incorrect, if Bharata's idea as a whole is rightly understood.

To sum up the main points of our criticism of Abhinava:

(1) His baseless assumption that the acceptance of the two sets of questions regarding *nāṭya* would lead to repetition.

(2) The impropriety of his specification of the five questions of the sixth Ch.

(3) The impossibility of his bringing out the four questions regarding *bhāvas*.

(4) The inexplicability of the reason given by him for Bharata's mention of *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta* in the context of the five questions.

(5) The mistake made by taking the verse *kintvalpasūtragranthārtham* to be the one meant to define *saṅgraha*.

(6) The meaning given to the above mentioned verse is one that is attained through painful efforts.

(7) The misinterpretation of *kārikā*.

(8) The introduction of far-fetched meanings in the interpretation of *nirukta*.

(9) The absurdity in his not showing the definition of *bhāṣya* while showing the definition of *sūtra*, which is read in the *N.Ś.* along with it, and also that of the *nirukta*, which is a part of it.

(10) The unsatisfactory interpretation of the verse, *saṅgraho yo mayā proktaḥ* etc. (Ch. 6, *Śl.* 14).

(11) The inexact nature of the terminology and the impossibility of the order of such matters as worked out by him.

(12) The far-fetched nature of the meaning 'individual definition' given to the word *nidarśana*.

(13) The superficial explanation of the purpose of quoting *ānuvaṃśya* verses.

From all this it becomes clear that Abhinava's interpretation of the seven words is incapable of explaining Bharata's idea. In certain cases he interprets on the strength of scholarship but rarely of facts. We have tried to clarify the reasons in certain cases for his interpretation in a particular way, whereas in some other cases nothing can be said. In fact, he is not wholly responsible for such an interpretation, as we have seen already. Certain ideas among those which he expresses were prevalent at least from the eighth century A.D. From the available evidence this much is traceable, but what was the reality we do not yet know fully. And we have nothing to do at present

with things which are unknown to us. We, however, know Abhinava's interpretation. So far as that goes, it fails to explain not only Bharata's text and idea, but also the chronological order of the literature on dramaturgy to which Bharata is considerably indebted. Therefore the conclusion is that from no point of view is Abhinava's interpretation of these seven words acceptable.

MODERN THEORIES

WE have tried to explain the earlier views on these matters in so far as they are known to us. If we now take a leap from these early days and come to the present era, we hardly find the signs of a new approach or interpretation of Bharata's text that might lead to a right perspective of the literature on dramaturgy and allied arts. The main reason for the failure of the modern attempts in these matters is obvious. Although a little divergence is noticeable here and there in certain minor aspects, yet on the whole all modern attempts are confined within the limits fixed by Abhinava. Because of this no modern scholar, in spite of certain new or modern methods, has been able to approach the *N.Ś.* with insight or independently of Abhinava. It is, therefore, not necessary to discuss the modern attempts separately or in detail. But as regards the slight divergences that some of these show, they may be briefly treated here.

In his revised edition of *The History of Sanskrit Poetics*, P.V. Kāṇe deals with our present problems. He is the only scholar uptill now to collect a large amount of material, especially from the *Abhinava-Bhāratī*, and to consider the present problems in that light. But this veteran scholar, too, accepts[87] Abhinava's statements, without so much as raising a single note of dissent. He accepts even the meaning put by Abhinava on Bharata's sentence, *sūtrānuviddhe*[88] (*sūtrārthānuviddhe*). We need not go into any detail regarding Kāṇe's theory as we have already devoted several pages clarifying our disagreement with Abhinava's interpretation on which Kāṇe is totally dependent. Apart from this, on the basis of the material available today Kāṇe advances a tentative theory about the 'kernel' of the *N.Ś.*, or the original text of it, which is free from the later additions and

[87] See *H.S.P.* (Kāṇe), pp. 10–61, and particularly pp. 14–8.

[88] Ibid., p. 17.

amendations. We will reserve our opinion on this and discuss it in the proper context. But it may be mentioned in passing that he does not try to trace in definite terms the chronology of the dramaturgic works of the pre-Bharata period, as S.K. De has done.

In his *History of Sanskrit Poetics*, Vol. I, S.K. De devotes a chapter (Ch. II) to Bharata which is divided into four sections. Our present problems are dealt with in the first two. Generally speaking, most of the points made in these sections are questionable. They may be briefly pointed out here.

Regarding the meanings of the *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* what De wishes to say is similar to Abhinava's view with this one exception, that in Abhinava's opinion there are several *sūtras* such as we have in the beginning of every prose passage or topic, especially in the sixth and seventh Chs., whereas De thinks there is only one *sūtra* (this is what appears from his statement).[89] We have fully discussed the difficulties in accepting meanings of the sort put forward by Abhinava and these need not be repeated here. Even if, for the sake of argument, these meanings are accepted, it is strange to say that there is one *sūtra* in the sixth Ch. which is unsupported. Further, S.K. De attaches much weight to the statements of such later authors as Bhavabhūti, who describes Bharata as *tauryatrikasūtrakāra*, but it need not or should not be done so, especially when the very text, i.e. the *N.Ś.*, does not prove the facts. Even if an author earlier than Bhavabhūti had mentioned these matters, we cannot conclude anything on such a basis when the text in question does not at all permit such a view of things.

The important thing to note here is De's failure to understand the significance of Bharata's adaptation of *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta* and their explanation.[90] Naturally this leads him to conclude several matters incorrectly. This will be clear when we examine these three terms later.

De distinguishes the prose passages of the sixth and seventh Chs. on the one hand, and those of the rest of the Chs. on the other. The

[89] '. . . for in Ch. VI we find a dictum on the genesis of *rasa*, put in the concise form of a *sūtra*, to the elucidation of which, after the manner of *Bhāṣya* or *Vṛtti*, the rest of the chapter [written in prose with verse quotations] is apparently devoted.' *H.S.P.* (De), Vol, I, pp. 27-8.

[90] Ibid., p. 28.

former he calls *sūtrabhāṣya*, and the latter 'independent prose-fragments'. But he does not show any sufficient reason for distinguishing them like that. He calls all the verses of the *N.Ś.* *kārikās* while similarly calling *ānuvaṃśyas* also *kārikās*, which he distinguishes from the former by saying that these latter belong to an earlier stage.[91] None of these statements or conclusions has any secure basis at all. If Abhinava calls *ānuvaṃśyas* as *kārikās* he does so with the mistaken notion of the definition that Bharata gives to *kārikā*. But unfortunately S.K. De does not seem to have even such a defective ground when he calls all the verses written by Bharata *kārikās*.

As shown here, he comes to a conclusion without giving much thought to different matters about the interrelation of these things and the chronological order of the texts. These matters will be touched in their proper places when we deal with the problems of chronology in the next pages.

Manomohan Ghosh, while translating the *N.Ś.* into English, does not follow Abhinava in some respects. But at the same time he does not seem to be able to catch Bharata's idea and fails, therefore, to give feasible meanings to these seven words. In some places his translation seems purely verbatim and a detailed discussion of his translation of those passages will hardly help us. We need not enter into it,[92] except to mention a few important things.

He specifies two questions to be connected with *bhāvas* accepting an incorrect reading. Thus the number of questions of the sixth Ch. is increased to six from the original five.[93] This is basically wrong. Also he translates *saṅgraha*, *kārikā*, and *nirukta* as digest, memorial verse, and etymology respectively.

So far as his preference for the words 'digest' and 'etymology' goes, it does not coincide with Bharata's view. The word 'digest' can never be an equivalent of *saṅgraha*, which is used, as we shall see, in the *N.Ś.* to mean *uddeśa* in a given sense. From his translation of two verses[94] it is clear that *saṅgraha*, 'digest' in his opinion, means the

[91] For all these matters *see* ibid., pp. 30-1.

[92] The interested reader can refer to E.T. of *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, pp. 100-5 and compare it with our explanation which will be given hereafter.

[93] Ibid., p. 100.

[94] Ibid., p. 101, verses 9-10.

prose passages but not *uddeśa*, and these passages constitute *sūtras* and *bhāṣya* (commentary). This he could say only by supplying some material as he in fact does. So the prose passages can be called *uddeśa* in his own way but not according to Bharata. Moreover, this does not explain the position. The word *nirukta* may be translated as etymology elsewhere, but certainly it is not the meaning in this particular place, although in Bharata's opinion etymology is included in *nirukta*. If it is the meaning of *nirukta*, then such an etymology helps this subject in no way and it is unnecessary to bring the etymology into the *N.Ś.* Moreover, if it is etymology, why should Bharata take pains to define what is useless to him? Therefore it must be corrected. His translation of *kārikā* as memorial verse, is based on a misunderstanding caused by the meaning of it with which we today and the medieval authors, too, are familiar. But it does not explain the meaning that Bharata intends, and this will be clear from our further discussion. Therefore, not only his translation of most of the verses is to be corrected but also his selection of terms—digest, memorial verse, and etymology.

He translates the word *nidarśana* as 'example' in three places[95] out of four. He leaves the fourth (p. 121, 8), probably following a similar reading in the Chow. edn. which leaves it out. Though the word 'example' is a popular and easy one, yet it is not clear from his text what he means by it. If he means by it analogy, it would be certainly wrong, as Bharata never uses it to mean such a thing and moreover whenever Bharata wants to say analogy, he uses the word, *dṛṣṭānta*. If Ghosh means illustration, that also would not be permissible, for there is no illustration given in the *N.Ś.* after the use of the word *nidarśana*. Thus, whatever he means by 'example', it is quite unacceptable as it is far from Bharata's idea.

The words *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* occur in the verse, *vistareṇopadiṣṭānām* etc., which is devoted to the definition of *saṅgraha*. As pointed out, this verse is wrongly translated by him. Whatever may be the validity of his translation, it is certain that he too takes *sūtra* to mean Bharata's first sentence of each prose passage, and *bhāṣya* to mean the commentary, which is nothing but the rest of the prose following *sūtra* (actually he supplies the word 'commentary' in

[95] Ibid., p. 170, 38; p. 108, 44-5; and p. 119, 5.

brackets after the word, *bhāṣya,* as its equivalent). This is also clear from one of his footnotes.[96] There is no ground for this also, even though he can lean on Abhinava for support. It is possible neither for Abhinava nor for Ghosh to say any such thing, as we have already pointed out while dealing with Abhinava's theory.

Manomohan Ghosh's translation of these technical words is frankly unacceptable, not because it is literally impossible to put such meanings to those words, but because it is based on an incorrect understanding of the *N.Ś.*, or rather of Bharata's intention.

[96] 'For a possible chronological implication of *Saṅgraha*, *Kārikā*, *Nirukta*, *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* mentioned in this chapter, see Skt. Poetics, Vol. I, [by S. K. De] p. 28ff'. E.T. of *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, p. 100. Note No. i. to verses 1-3.

PART II

NEW INTERPRETATION

IN the foregoing pages we have seen how the old and modern scholars interpret the seven technical terms of Bharata. We have also noted what would be the result of such interpretations.[1] As none among them seems satisfactory, we should approach them in a different way, and interpret them so as to get a logical meaning and a right perspective of the earlier literature on dramatic arts.

NECESSITY OF POSING A SECOND SET OF FIVE QUESTIONS IN THE SIXTH CHAPTER

BHARATA begins his text, the *N.Ś.*, with an episode concerning the birth of *nāṭya* and the problems that arose with it, but the subject proper is taken up only from the sixth Ch. onward. Though the episode proper is practically completed in the first Ch. itself, yet Bharata continues the topic uptill the end of the fifth Ch. This is done in order to provide a full understanding of the conditions connected with the episode of *nāṭya*.

For the proper understanding of those conditions it is necessary to have an idea about the context in which they have been dealt with. So the episode may be here explained only to the extent of its bearing on those matters. The very theme, according to the *N.Ś.*, that was composed in keeping with the newly created dramatic technique is *Amṛtamanthana*, and the *dānavas*, demons, who felt insulted by this theme, took offence at the first performance itself, and they put obstacles to it. With the intention of saving it from them Brahma ordered Viśvakarma, the architect, to build a house suitable for dramatic performances. This was accordingly built. In this episode we can notice three requirements: It is customary to perform some rites or at least to offer a prayer or salutation to the gods at the beginning of an act or a deed. The performance of

[1] Heretofore we have used certain technical terms and their synonyms in accordance with those scholars whose theories are under question, so such usages do not bind us and hereafter we use the words in accordance with our own understanding and preference.

drama, too, is not an exception to this general rule. Moreover, the disturbances created by the demons made such propitiatory gestures all the more necessary. It is mainly in this way that *pūrvaraṅga* became an inevitable feature of the dramatic performance. Secondly, a theatre also became necessary to stay the external disturbances. Thirdly, the newly built playhouse made it necessary to conduct some other rituals or rites (*gṛhapraveśavidhi*). In the first Ch. the whole episode is generally depicted, while the next four Chs. are devoted to the matters that are closely connected with this episode. In this connection the problems of constructing a theatre are dealt with in the second Ch., and the *gṛhapraveśavidhi* in the third.

To continue, some time after the successful staging of *Amṛtamanthana* in the newly built playhouse, Brahma wished to show it to Śiva and went to him along with Bharata and his troupe. Pleased with the performance, Śiva offered Brahma his art of *nṛtta* to be added to *pūrvaraṅga* in order to make it all the more vivid. Thus a new element was added to dramatic performance, although not to the drama proper. This subject, i.e. *nṛtta*, is dealt with in the fourth Ch. But till now the method of *pūrvaraṅga* is not dealt with at all. That comes only in the fifth Ch.

It is now easy to get an idea of the relation between these subjects on the one hand and *nāṭya* proper on the other. Since there is a general agreement on the subject, no argument is needed for stating that *pūrvaraṅga* and the rules guiding it fall outside *nāṭya* and its technique. How the necessity of *pūrvaraṅga* arose is stated in the episode, and that is why the *pūrvaraṅga* is dealt with in connection with the episode itself, i.e. before the subjects required by *nāṭya* are started.

Nṛtta is connected with *pūrvaraṅga*, rather it is added to it, as is evident from the episode itself. But *nṛtta* is never added to *nāṭya* proper. But somehow there is a misunderstanding in this connection.[2] People who hold the view that *nṛtta* is closely connected with *nāṭya* proper may even show as an internal evidence the treatment of *nṛtta* in the fourth Ch. of the *N.Ś.*, and cite Bharata's statement, '*asya śākhā ca nṛttaṃ ca tathaivāṅkura eva ca vastūnyabhinayasyeha vijñeyāni prayoktṛbhiḥ*'.[3] But these—whether they

[2] E.T. of *N.Ś.*, Introduction, pp. xlii-xliv.

[3] *N.Ś.*, Vol. II, Ch. 8, p. 3.

be internal or external—are mistaken evidences. Such statements reveal only the influence exerted by *nṛtta* on *nāṭya* in the matter of bodily composition of the actor, but nothing more. So far as the elaborate treatment of *nṛtta* in the *N.Ś.* goes, it is plain from the episode as well as an indisputable statement[4] that it is treated here in connection with *pūrvaraṅga* and to be added to it, but not in connection with *naṭya* nor as auxiliary to it. This is proved beyond doubt by the fact that it was not included in *saṅgraha*, the table of the subjects that *nāṭya* requires. Here another fact should also be noted. *Karaṇas*, the basic units of the *nṛtta* themselves, are composed of *nṛttahastas*, *cārīs* and *sthānas*. *Karaṇas* and *aṅgaharas* are expounded in the fourth Ch., but *nṛttahastas* in the ninth Ch., and *cārīs* and *sthānas* in the eleventh. Even then this fact, i.e. the treatment of *nṛttahastas*, *cārīs* and *sthānas* in the portion which is devoted to the proper subjects of *nāṭya*, does not prove that *nṛtta* is considered by Bharata to be an auxiliary to *nāṭya*. *Nṛtta* as such is never introduced into *nāṭya*. But the material of *nṛtta*, such as *cārīs* and others, as such is introduced into *nāṭya* in few places to produce certain effects when the two independent arts *nṛtta* and *nāṭya* came into contact. (We have discussed these matters in some detail in another work,* so we need not now go into further detail.) Therefore it is certain that *nṛtta* is treated in the *N.Ś.* only in connection with *pūrvaraṅga* as an art to be used in it as it is, but not as an auxiliary to *nāṭya* proper and it is quite reasonable to expound it along with *pūrvaraṅga*, that is to say, outside the subject matter of *nāṭya*. In this connection it is interesting to note that *nṛtta* is expounded even before the method of conducting *pūrvaraṅga* is explained. This is not without reason. After adding the element of *nṛtta*, *pūrvaraṅga* splits into two varieties—*śuddha* and *citra*—so unless *nṛtta* is explained, the method or the rules of *citra-pūrvaraṅga* cannot be fully accounted for. It is for this that *nṛtta* is explained earlier, though it is brought and expounded in connection with *pūrvaraṅga*. Thus it is clear that *nṛtta* falls outside the subjects which are required by *nāṭya* and its treatment in the episode is quite logical because *pūrvaraṅga* itself, to which it is added, is to be dealt with properly in the episode.

[4] Ibid., Vol. I, Ch. 4, verses 13-16, pp. 87-8.

* *N*: *T.M.R.*, pp. 66-7 and also pp. 72-5.

Now we are to look at *raṅga*. As we shall find, *raṅga* is actually one among the eleven subjects that are enlisted as requirements of *nāṭya*. So from the fact that it is dealt with in the second Ch. we need not assume that from the very beginning of the *N.Ś.*, i.e. from chapters earlier than the sixth chapter, Bharata begins to deal with the subjects that *nāṭya* proper requires. On the contrary, we should assume that only because the topic of *raṅga* arose in the episode this subject is dealt with in the second Ch. So the question of Bharata's dealing with the requirements of *nāṭya* from the very beginning, i.e. from the chapters earlier than the sixth Ch., does not arise. This is clearly proved by the continuation of the episode in some form or the other till the end of the fifth Ch., although much of it is completed in the first Ch. itself. In the episode the topic of the obstacles created by demons raises the necessity of explaining *raṅga* and this again in its turn causes the need for explaining the *raṅgadaivatapūjana* or *gṛhapraveśavidhi*.

All of this explanation is based on the text as available in print. But in fact there are certain portions in the first five Chs. that are highly questionable and that *raṅga* should be dealt with in the second Ch. is equally questionable. Yet all such matters cannot be discussed here and they will be taken up later on. What we insist is that the whole text of the *N.Ś.* should be considered to consist of two units —introductory to *nāṭya* in general, and expounding the requirements of *nāṭya*. The portion from the very beginning to the beginning of the Ch. on *rasa* makes the former unit, and the rest of it makes the latter. After the general introduction to *nāṭya* one should begin to explain the requirements of *nāṭya*. Bharata begins to expound the requirements of *nāṭya* from the sixth Ch. and here an introduction to the text is a necessity. Obviously the introduction to the text is quite different from that of *nāṭya* in general.

IS THERE ANY RELATION BETWEEN THE TWO SETS OF QUESTIONS?

THERE is, then, a need to begin with the explanation of the matters required by *nāṭya* in the opening of the sixth Ch. Out of this necessity some other questions arise. It is true also for the reason that Bharata adopts a method of introducing new subjects with

the help of questions. Accordingly Bharata starts, as we have seen, the sixth Ch. of the *N.Ś.* with a set of five questions. Also we have seen that there is another set of five questions in the first Ch. So there is no need for their immediate presentation. First we shall see whether or not there is any relation or interdependence between these two sets and then proceed to specify the set of questions of the sixth Ch. The five questions mentioned in the first Ch. (these are quoted by us in Part I as footnote 2) are quite general in nature, that is to say, they are concerned with the general matters of *nāṭya* but not at all with any specific matters. The general nature of these five questions is quite obvious and it needs no explanation, except to mention that the answers to be sought would also be of a general nature. In other words, those questions work only as an introduction to *nāṭya* but cannot fulfil the demand for the explanation of specific matters connected with this art. According to their nature all the five questions are answered by Bharata in a general way in the first Ch. itself. But as against this view Abhinava holds that all these five questions are not answered in the first Ch. itself. He further says that Bharata does not answer them in any particular chapter or chapters, as all the chapters are meant to answer these five questions alone. Determined with that view, he naturally fails to realise the nature of the five questions of the first Ch. Apart from this, his specification or interpretation of these five questions too is not acceptable.

Bharata certainly answers these five questions in the first Ch. itself in the following way: He answers the first question in five verses[5] — *bhavadbhiś śucibhir bhūtvā .. .. dṛśyaṃ śravyaṃ ca yad bhavet* — and the second question in the verse,[6] *na vedavyavahāro'yam*, etc. The third one is answered in the verse,[7] *jagrāha pāṭhyam*, etc. The fourth one is answered in the verse,[8] *saptadvīpānukaraṇam*, etc. The last, i.e. the fifth, is answered in the verse,[9] *yoyaṃ svabhavo loksya*, etc. Some of the matters stated in these verses may be found here and there in the same Ch. and they should be explained in a different way. But there cannot be any doubt that these five questions are answered in the verses cited here. With the understanding of these answers to the five questions one can

[5] *N.Ś.*, *Śls.* 7-11, pp. 8-10. [6] Ibid., *Śl.* 12, p. 11. [7] Ibid., *Śl.* 17, p. 14.
[8] Ibid., *Śl.* 117, p. 42. [9] Ibid., *Śl.* 119, p. 42.

fairly realise *nāṭya* in a general way, which means that the purpose of these questions is well served.

It is obvious that the third question (*katyaṅgaḥ*) seeks the answer concerning the constituents or elements (lit. limbs) of *nāṭya*. So it is doubtless that the answer given to it is a list of its constituents. These are: (*i*) *rasas*, (*ii*) *pāṭhya*, (*iii*) *abhinayas*, and (*iv*) *gāna*. Now the question may be asked, how can the *rasa*, being the thing or fruit or effect that should be attained from *nāṭya*, be considered as a constituent or limb of *nāṭya*? On this point people may differ or agree, that is a different matter. But its inclusion here leads to no harm or absurdity. Bharata includes it, that is a fact, so we are to deal with it in accordance with the reality. From the above discussion we came to know that the five questions of the first Ch. are concerned with *nāṭya* in general and the third seeks the answer about the constituents or limbs of *nāṭya*.

A set of five questions is posed in regard to the general nature of *nāṭya* in the first Ch., and all of them find suitable answers there. One of these is related to the birth of *nāṭya* in answer to which the need to tell the episode arises. The episode in its turn brings some allied topics like *raṅga*, *nṛtta*, *pūrvaraṅga*, etc. Along with all such things the episode itself is completed by the end of the fifth Ch. Therefore the occasion arises to deal with *nāṭya* in detail, that is to say that *nāṭya* should now be explained comprehensively through dealing with its requirements as clearly as possible, as completely as possible. This necessitates a set of questions which enables Bharata to lay down certain basic principles which extend the scope for elaboration and also clarify the method adopted. To meet with this new demand Bharata poses another set of five questions in the beginning of the sixth Ch. From this it is now clear that the proper subjects of *nāṭya*, in other words the *Nāṭyaśāstra*, practically begin with the sixth Ch. It is true also theoretically, even if it be that *raṅga*, one of the proper subjects or requirements of *nāṭya*, has been explained before the sixth Ch. *Raṅga* is treated before in order to complete the episode. The explanation of *raṅga* in the second Ch. does not violate the truth that the *Nāṭyaśāstra* as a treatise commences to deal with the subjects proper from the sixth Ch. This will be proved by the fact that nowhere is *uddeśa* of any sort written before the sixth Ch. If any treatise is completed without

any *uddeśa* at all, that would be quite a different matter. When *uddeśa* is present in the work, that should be taken into notice. Here *uddeśa*, which should generally come before commencement of the discussion on the subject proper, is seen at the beginning of the sixth Ch. Taking this point also as basis, one may draw a conclusion that the actual treatment of the subjects required by *nāṭya* commences from the sixth Ch. Therefore it is not unfair to conclude that the set of five questions raised at the beginning of the sixth Ch. is concerned with the specific things of *nāṭya*, whereas the set of five questions of the first Ch. is concerned only with the general nature of *nāṭya*. The latter set is not, as Abhinava thinks, an elaboration of either the former set or of a single question (*katyaṅgaḥ*). Hence both have their own independent status. They serve different purposes and do not depend in any way on each other.

Abhinava thinks that the five questions of the sixth Ch. deal with the things raised by one of the five questions of the first Ch., viz. *katyaṅgaḥ*, and he adds that these specifically deal with one of the *aṅgas*, namely the *rasa*, as it is quite important. Our discussion disproves such an interpretation. As we have seen the five questions of the sixth Ch. have no connection with and are in no way dependent on the five questions of the first Ch., nor do they deal with the matters raised by one of those questions, namely *katyaṅgaḥ*. These questions of the sixth Ch. should be, therefore, looked at in a different light and interpreted in quite a different manner. Abhinava's specification of the questions of the sixth Ch. is to some extent, if not fully, based on the relation which he assumes between the two sets of the questions. And since this is quite wrong, it goes without saying that his specification, too, is untenable. It is plain, then, that the specification of the five questions of the sixth Ch. should be made in a new light and that these questions are meant to explain the requirements of *nāṭya* comprehensively. Therefore, the real specification must be such as will cover the whole range of *nāṭya*, and not, as Abhinava suggests, *rasas* and *bhāvas* alone, which but partially explain *nāṭya*.

SPECIFICATION OF THE LATTER SET OF FIVE QUESTIONS

In the sixth Ch. the two verses where the five questions are mentioned read differently in different MSS. (This is clear from the readings noted in the G.O.S., K.M. and Chow. edns.) These verses have been previously quoted by us with the readings that are acceptable to Abhinava. The readings preferred by Abhinava are not acceptable to us and we quote them here again with what we take to be the right readings:

ye rasā iti paṭhyante nāṭye nāṭyavicakṣaṇaiḥ
rasatvaṃ kena vai teṣā meta dākhyātu marhasi
bhāvāś caiva hi ye proktāḥ kiṃ vā te bhāvayantyapi[ii]
saṅgrahaṃ[iii] *kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ cābhidhatsva*[iv] *naḥ.*[10]

Freely translated, these mean:

1. Explain how those that are called the *rasas* attain the *rasatva*, or to put it in a simpler way, how the *rasas* are called so? And
2. what do those that are called *bhāvas*, produce? And tell about
3. *saṅgraha*,
4. *kārikā* and
5. *nirukta*,
   that is, tell us what is *saṅgraha*, what is *kārikā* and what is *nirukta*.[11]

[10] Ibid., Ch. 6, *Śls.* 2-3, p. 261.

(*i*) Here the reading, *bhāvāś caiva*, as printed in the body of the text, may be accepted.

(*ii*) Here readings, *kiṃ ca te bhāvayanti hi, bhāvayanti vā*, are noted in the G.O.S. and K.M. edns. In these *kiṃ ca* is obviously incorrect and (*bhāvayanti*) *vā* also is incorrect, as *vā* is a repetition. *Bhāvayantyapi* or *bhāvayanti hi* may be taken to be correct and both of them go with *kim* and the form of question would be *kiṃ vā hi* or *kiṃ vāpi*, both of which, then, mean the same.

(*iii*) The Chow. edn. informs us that a MS. does not at all read this verse and the other which follows it. This need not be taken seriously, as in the absence of these verses not only would the questions be incomplete but also the context.

(*iv*) This reading is noted in G.O.S. edn. and it is far better than the reading preferred by Abhinava, viz., *caiva tattvataḥ*, though the latter is not absolutely incorrect. It seems that Abhinava prefers the latter only because it allows him to do some patch work, when he breaks it into several words.

[11] The same is attainable when these are commented in the following way:

This kind of interpretation leads to other questions and it would not be in vain to try to answer them. After a while Bharata defines *saṅgraha* and mentions eleven subjects including *rasas* and *bhāvas*. So three questions — concerning (1) *saṅgraha*, (2) *kārikā* and (3) *nirukta* — would suffice to deal with all the subjects required by *nāṭya*, and any questions regarding a particular subject of them would be quite unnecessary. If such questions are permitted or necessary, Bharata should devote a question to each of those eleven subjects. Why, then, should Bharata devote separately two questions to the *rasas* and *bhāvas*? If the things are looked at only from the point of view of the subjects required by *nāṭya*, there should not be, it is true, any questions devoted to the *rasas* and *bhāvas*. But Bharata is looking at these things from more than one point of view. Apart from the requirements of *nāṭya*, there are two other points of view from which he looks at *rasas* and *bhāvas* and that is why he devotes two questions to them separately. One is the importance of these two subjects and the second is that he must show the scope of the sixth and seventh Chs. In order to meet with this demand he provides two separate questions to the *rasas* and *bhāvas* which are dealt with respectively in the sixth and seventh Chs. This is evidenced by two verses which follow the above five questions. These are:

teṣāṃ tu vacanaṃ śrutvā munīnāṃ bharato muniḥ
pratyuvāca punar vākyaṃ rasabhāvavikalpanam[12]

nāṭya iti nāṭyaśāstre nāṭyopadeśapare śāstre rasā iti nāṭyavicakṣaṇair ye paṭhyante teṣāṃ kena vai kiṃ kāraṇena katha miti vā rasatva mityekaḥ, yecaivahi bhāvāḥ proktāḥ kiṃ vāpi te bhāvayantyutpādayanti iti dvitīyaś cetyetat yadetat viṣaya-dvitayaṃ tadākhyātuṃ vivṛṇotu marhasi / yadvā kena vaiteṣāsṃ rasatvaṃ etadākhyātu marhasi / ye cāpi hi bhāvāḥ proktāḥ te kiṃ vā bhāvayanti / api etadapi ākhyātu marhasi / ye ca rasā ityucyante teṣāṃ tādṛśābhikhyāhetu meva na kevalaṃ ye cāpi bhāvā ityucyante te kimu votpādayantītyetadapi vaktu marhasīti yāvat / saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ niruktaṃ ceti nāṭyasambandhi yat tritaya masti tadapi no'bhidhatsva kathaya / itthasṃ dvikoṭikaṃ pañcapraśnaṃ etat samādhehi / yacca praśnapañca-kasyottaratayā labhyate tadeva nāṭyasya nikhilaṃ / prāpte cottare na kiñci cchiṣyate jñātavyaṃ nāṭyasambandhi / koṭidvayakalpanayā prastutādhyāya-dvayapratipā-dyaviṣayasūcanāyā anyat kiñcit prayojanaṃ na sādhyate yadvā nāsti sādhayitavyam/

[12] *N.Ś.*, pp. 161-2. Here the word *vikalpanam* means *lakṣaṇam*. Abhinava too interprets this word in the same way in one place, '*śubhāśubhavikalpakaḥ*'. On this he comments that '*śubhāśubhaṃ ca dharmādharmarūpaṃ sukhaduḥkha-*

ahaṃ vaḥ kathayiṣyāmi nikhilena tapodhanāḥ
saṅgrahaṃ kārikāṃ caiva niruktaṃ ca yathākramam.

Therefore our specification of the five questions would prove quite plausible.

Unlike the question *rasatvaṃ kena vai teṣām* the question regarding *bhāvas*, viz. *kim vā te bhāvayantyapi* presupposes some amount of knowledge on the part of the questioner. Then how do *munis* come to know this subject and can question on this? Thus an objection may be raised against our specification of the question. But the charge of this type carries no value, at least it can be expected that in the present day no importance will be attached to such matters. In any case it can be easily answered. The fact of the matter is that no *muni* asks about anything; it is simply a method that Bharata adopts to expound different matters clearly. Both questions and answers are by Bharata. This is accepted by an earlier commentator like Abhinava.[13] Even if it is accepted that it is the *munis* who question Bharata, this makes no difference. It is universally accepted that the *ānuvaṃśya* verses are prior to Bharata; we find *rasas* and *bhāvas* discussed in them. There is no specific evidence to show that those *munis* do not at all know those theories, at least in a general way, so on the basis of earlier works, viz. *ānuvaṃśya* verses, we can assume that it is possible for *munis* to hear about *bhāvas* and also other things of *nāṭya*, at least in a general way. Therefore, it is not impossible or improper for them to raise in this place some question about *bhāvas*.

There is no impropriety in the way we have specified the five questions. According to the order of the questions, and also in accordance with contents of the fourth and fifth verses of the sixth Ch. (quoted above), Bharata is to deal at first with *rasas* and then

phalatvena vibhedena kalpayatyadhyavasāyayati nāṭyavedaḥ' (*A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 1, p. 34). M.M. Ghosh translates it as 'distinction'.

[13] '*atha muni rātmāna meva paratvena kalpayan brahmaṇā yadudāhṛta mityetadeva purākalpadarśanena niścāyayati samāptajapya mityādinā ślokadvayena*' *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 1, p. 6.

'*bhagavatā tatrabhavatā guruṇeti bharatamuni revaiva muktaḥ / tena bharata muninā yo grathitaḥ*' Ibid.

'*evaṃ bharatamuniḥ paravadātmānaṃ parikalpyeyantaṃ grantha mabhihitavān*' Ibid., p. 8.

bhāvas, and afterwards *saṅgraha*, *kārikā*, and *nirukta* in succession. On the contrary, he first takes *saṅgraha* and defines it, and before defining it he also gives some reason in three verses (6-8), for the necessity of furnishing *saṅgraha*. After *saṅgraha*, he completes *kārikā* and *nirukta* and then he takes the *rasa* from a prose passage following the thirty-first verse and up to the beginning of the seventh Ch. he never touches the matter of the second question, viz. *bhāva*. Therefore, this particular process again supports our interpretation which mainly aims at three points: (*i*) the explanation of the real subject matters of *nāṭya* does not start before the sixth Ch., (*ii*) the five questions should cover the whole range of the subject-matter of *nāṭya*; and (*iii*) owing to the importance of the *rasa* and *bhāvas* and also in order to show the scope of the sixth and seventh Chs. of the *N.Ś.* two questions are separately devoted to them though they are included in *saṅgraha*. The change of the order of the exposition from that of the questions would be explicable only if our specification and explanation is accepted. It is in no way unscientific to deal first with *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*, in other words it is quite proper to take up the *rasa* after them and then *bhāvas* in the seventh Ch.

INTRODUCTION TO SAṄGRAHA

AFTER noting the reasons for the change in the treatment of the subjects, it is necessary to try to understand the reasons which Bharata gives for his reliance on *saṅgraha*. What he says in this place is a kind of introduction to *saṅgraha*, where *saṅgraha* is described along with its function. Bharata says that 'even with a great difficulty it is not possible to exhaust the science of dramaturgy, because the sciences required for it are too many, and also the arts and crafts ancillary to it are innumerable. Even when it is impossible to exhaust any one of those ocean-like subjects, then is it necessary to mention that it is impossible to exhaust all such subjects in accordance with the true state of things? But I (Bharata) will speak of a *saṅgraha* of this *nāṭya*, the *saṅgraha* which consists of the *rasas, bhavas*, etc., and bears bare (*alpa*) things (i.e. matters or subjects) expounded in the *Sūtra*-work (*sūtragrantha*) and also provides the

conjecture'[14] [on all that *nāṭya* needs]. To put it simply, as *nāṭya* requires a knowledge of several sciences as well as arts, it is not possible to explain *nāṭya* completely, so a *saṅgraha* of it is said to give the basic idea about the bare subjects required by *nāṭya*, the basic idea which helps to circumscribe it briefly. Before defining *saṅgraha*, he describes it thus, for he will need it a good deal in future. He attaches considerable importance to it, as we shall see later on.

SAṄGRAHA DEFINED

After this introduction he defines *saṅgraha* thus: 'A comprehensive collection of the things (i.e. matters or subjects) explained (lit. taught) elaborately in the *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya* [on it], is called *saṅgraha*'. To quote the verse:

vistareṇopadiṣṭānā marthānāṃ sūtrabhāṣyayoḥ
nibandho yas samāsena saṅgrahaṃ taṃ vidur budhāḥ[15]

Although the word, *alpa* or its synonym is not used in this verse, yet it implies such a meaning.[16] It is clear from the trend or from

[14] '*na śakya masya nāṭyasya gantu mantaṃ kathañcana* /
kasmādbahutvād jñānānāṃ śilpānāṃ vāpyanantataḥ //
ekasyāpi na vai śakya mantaṃ jñānārṇavasya hi /
gantuṃ puna ranyeṣāṃ jñānānā marthatattvataḥ //
*kintvalpasūtra*granthārtha manumānaprasādhakam* /
nāṭyasyāsya pravakṣyāmi rasabhāvādisaṅgraham //
N.Ś., Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śls.* 6-8, pp. 262-3.

* Here there is another reading, *gūḍhārtha*, which M.M. Ghosh adopts in translating this verse. His translation seems to be defective. The word *kintu* (in the third of these) indicates clearly that this verse goes together with the above two verses and from the context it is plain that this verse is not meant to define *saṅgraha*, but is meant to describe it along with its purpose too. But, as shown, Abhinava takes it as though it is a defining verse. Apart from it, he takes the word *anumāna* entirely in the technical sense and interprets it accordingly. This, too, is not acceptable, as there is neither ground for nor any meaning in it. Here it means nothing but conjecture (*ūhā*).

[15] Ibid., Though the word *saṅgraha* is used here and also in the above verse (e.g. *rasabhāvādisaṅgraha*) in a particular sense yet it does not lose its literal meaning altogether, *saṅgrāhyante viṣayā atra* or *anena*.

[16] Here it may be said that there is no necessity to depend on implied meaning, and the word *samāsena* is in the verse to give the meaning 'briefly'.

the context and it is evidenced by *alpasūtragranthārtha* of the descriptive verse and also from another usage, *eva meṣo'lpasūtrārtho nirdiṣṭo nāṭyasaṅgrahaḥ.*[17] It means that a just and comprehensive collection is *saṅgraha*, or, to put it more clearly, *saṅgraha* is a mere, yet comprehensive, collection of the subjects dealt with at length in the *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya* on it.

From this discussion we came to know that *saṅgraha* is a mere collection of the names of all the subjects without leaving anything expounded at length in the *Sūtra*-work and in the *Bhāṣya* on it. We may, with our customary or habitual understanding, take this *saṅgraha* as an *uddeśa* where the subjects intended to be dealt with are mentioned just by name. We cannot, however, in the strict sense take it so. Because *uddeśa*, as we understand it, is nothing but a table of contents, here the question whether or not the contents referred to are dealt with in other works, implicitely earlier works, does not arise, whereas in the case of *saṅgraha* this question arises and the contents listed in it must be those explained in detail in the older works. This is the idea that we get from the verse written to define *saṅgraha*.

SAṄGRAHA SHOWN

THE following is the *nāṭyasaṅgraha* given by Bharata:

rasā bhāvā hyabhinayā dharmīvṛttipravṛttayaḥ
siddhis svarāstathātodyaṃ gānaṃ raṅgaś ca saṅgrahaḥ.[18]

It is true there is nothing to prevent one from taking *samāsena* in that sense, when it is preferable and one cannot insist that *alpa* must be brought. Still we do so or we prefer to maintain the uniformity with the meaning that this word gives in other places. The word *samāsena* is also used in the definition of *kārikā* and *nirukta* and Abhinava takes it to mean *vistāra* in the definition of *kārikā* and *saṅkṣepa* in the definition of *nirukta*. But in both cases it certainly gives the meaning 'comprehensively'. In all these three places *samāsena* does not mean *vistareṇa* but means only *sākalyena*. Some times uniformity in itself may not be an achievement, so one need not insist much on this also. It is rather a preference and by this, we believe, a finer shade of meaning can be attained, viz. 'a mere yet comprehensive collection'.

[17] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 271.

[18] Ibid., *Śl.* 10, p. 263. Several variants are found in different edns. only the important ones of which are noted here. In the G.O.S. edn. *rasabhāvā* is in

In this verse certain subjects such as *ātodya*, *gāna*, etc., are found in the singular number while the others in the plural and in compound words. This is anomalous. According to the nature of *saṅgraha* as well as *kārikā* every subject should be mentioned here in the singular only or in *dvandvasamāsa*, i.e. individualising each of the subjects which we should take in the singular. This point will be clear from our further discussion where we shall again draw attention to it. As it is, some of the readings should be amended. This may be done in different ways. Taking the variant, *rasabhāvā*, noted below, as a clue, we may read *rasabhāvā vabhinayaḥ* or *raso bhāvohyabhinayo* instead *rasā bhāvā hyabhinayāḥ*. As the metre does not permit the reading *vṛtti* and *pravṛtti* either in the singular or as a compound, we should read them along with *dharmī* in a compound as *dharmivṛtti-pravṛttayaḥ*, which reading is actually available from the Chow. edn. Similarly we should either read *siddhiḥ svaraḥ* or *siddhisvarau* instead of *siddhiḥ svarāḥ*. With these amendations the whole verse should be read in the following way:

rasabhāvā vabhianayo dharmi-vṛtti-pravṛttayaḥ
siddhis svaras tathātodyaṃ gāmaṃ raṅgaś ca saṅgrahaḥ.

Now it means that *saṅgraha* (i.e. *nāṭyasaṅgraha*) consists of *rasa*, *bhāva*, *abhinaya*, *dharmī*, *vṛtti*, *pravṛtti*, *siddhi*, *svara*, *ātodya*, *gāna* and *raṅga*. In other words, these subjects are counted or mentioned in the *naṭyasaṅgraha* or else they may constitute *nāṭyasaṅgraha*. A verse of similar nature[19] is found, except in the Chow. edn., after

the place of *rasābhāvā*, *dharmavṛtti* for *dharmīvṛtti* and in the first edn. *raṅgasya prakṛti reva ca* probably in the place of the whole of the last line of the verse, but it is indicated in the print to be in the place of *raṅgaśca*. The Chow. edn. reads *dharmivṛttipravṛttayaḥ* which is correct, while *raṅgaṃ ca* is read instead of *raṅgaśca*. The K.M. and Chow. edns. read *siddhisvarā* in the place of *siddhiḥ svarāḥ*.

[19] '*upacāras tathā viprā maṇḍapāś ceti sarvaśaḥ / trayodaśavidho hyeṣa hyādiṣṭo nāṭyasaṅgrahaḥ*' // See first edn. p. 266. This verse is omitted in the second edn. This is indicated by the editors to be interpolated verse and Abhinava does neither comment on it nor mention it. Beyond a doubt it is an interpolation because in it the words *maṇḍapa* and *saṅgraha*, also seen in the previous verse, occur. This interpolated verse may help us to assume certain things concerning certain subjects and textual problems which will be discussed in due course.

this *saṅgraha*. But it is, beyond doubt, an interpolation and need not be taken into account here.

Although the three subjects—*rasa*, *abhinaya*, and *gāna*—are found here, the subjects which are also mentioned in the reply to the third question (*katyaṅgaḥ*) of the first Ch., yet it is not at all a repetition, nor does it lead to any contradiction or clash or any such thing. The verse, *jagrāha pāṭhyam*, etc., is said and should be taken as a reply to the question about what constitutes *nāṭya*, and the present verse *rasabhāvau* etc., should be taken as a reply to the question of what *nāṭya* requires. This is confirmed by the mention of certain things like *raṅga*, *siddhi*, *vṛtti* and *pravṛtti* in this verse. It is beyond a shadow of a doubt that *raṅga* and *siddhi* can never be constituents of *nāṭya*. Even *vṛtti* cannot be so, for it is closely related with *rasa*. If so, it is needless to say that *pravṛtti*, dependent on *vṛtti*, cannot be such either. Even *dharmī*, which is a mode of representation, cannot be a constituent. Then, what are these? The only answer is what we have suggested, that these are the requirements of *nāṭya*. So far as the verse, *jagrāha pāṭhyam*, is concerned, the things mentioned in it are clearly designated by way of question to be *aṅga* (*katyaṅgaḥ*). So one need not newly strive to determine them. Therefore, it is quite correct to say that this verse is an answer to the question about the requirements of *nāṭya*, while the verse, *jagrāha pāṭhyam*, etc., is an answer to the question about the constituents of *nāṭya*.

Thus Bharata completes *saṅgraha*. It is necessary to recapitulate the order of things followed by Bharata, for it is a highly revealing factor. The necessity of *saṅgraha* is explained at first after which it is described along with its usefulness. Next it is defined and thereafter given or presented.

KĀRIKĀ DEFINED

IMMEDIATELY after giving *saṅgraha*, Bharata defines *kārikā* thus: '*kārikā*, displayer of the subjects is that where the things (matters or subjects) would be said comprehensively with a slight clarification in accordance with the *Sūtra* i.e. *Sūtra*-work.' To quote his verse:

alpābhidhānenārtho yas samāsenocyate budhaiḥ/
sūtrataḥ sā tu vijñeyā kārikā'rthapradarśinī//[20]

The two compounds used in this, viz. *alpābhidhānena* and *arthapradarśinī*, are important in this definition. These give the meaning that *kārikā* exhibits the things with a bit of explanation. We have noticed that *saṅgraha* is said to be *alpasūtrārtha* and we see *alpābhidhāna* in the definition of *kārikā*. If the word *alpa* qualifies the same thing in both the cases, it would lead to meaninglessness. In *saṅgraha* it qualifies *artha*, subject, while in *kārikā* it qualifies *abhidhāna* (=*vacana* = *vivaraṇa*), clarification or explanation. This means that the subjects should be mentioned in *saṅgraha* just by name, and in *kārikā* the same things should be mentioned, but with a bit of explanation. *Abhidhāna*, clarification or explanation, can be conducted in a number of ways depending on the different aspects of the things. What, then, is meant here by *abhidhāna*? *Abhidhāna* in this place is concerned with the variety, or, strictly speaking, with the division of each subject mentioned in *saṅgraha* just by name. This can be known from what Bharata gives as an example of *kārikā*.

Thus, *kārikā* is that which displays the subjects of *nāṭya* after their comprehensive division in accordance with the *Sūtra*-work. *Saṅgraha* counts or notes just the subjects of *nāṭya* while *kārikā* the classified subjects or the division of each and every subject matter. *Kārikā* is thus a kind of explanation of *saṅgraha*. This is why we have stated that there is a necessity to amend the readings of the verse in which *nāṭyasaṅgraha* is given and we did it too.

So *kārikā* does not stand in this place for what we understand

[20] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I. Ch. 6, p. 264. In the second edn. *sānumantavyā* is read in the place of *sātu vijñeyā* of the first edn. (p. 266) and we have mentioned already that the reading, *sā tu vijñeyā*, is correct. If this verse is explained in Sanskrit it runs thus:
alpābhidhānena abhidhāna matra vivaraṇaṃ alpavivaraṇena sākaṃ yadvā dvārā artho viṣayas samāsena sākalyena budhais sūtrataḥ sūtragrantha manusṛtya ya ucyate sā tu arthapradarśinī vastūni viṣayāṇītyarthaḥ darśayantī kārikā jñeyā / yadyapi ya iti puṃliṅgenātra nirdeśas tathāpi vastutas satvartha ityasya na viśeṣaṇam, akārikārūpatvāt viṣayasya / vastuta stvayaṃ kārikā meva parāmṛśyate / ato yadi-tyasya tulyaḥ / yadvā yadityeva mūlapāṭho vā bhavet ya iti tu prāmādikaśca / evaṃ ca yatrārthas sūtrato'lpābhidhānena sākaṃ budhai rucyate sā tu arthapradarśinī kārikā vijñeyetyarthaḥ //

by the word today, keeping in mind things like *Sāṅkhya-kārikā*, *Vākyapadīya-kārikā*, etc. Abhinava is wrong when he interprets it in two ways — *lakṣaṇavākya* and *ānuvaṃśya* verses. As has been seen, with some twists he also says that *saṅgraha* is *uddeśa* which is of two kinds, simple *uddeśa* and *uddeśa-vibhāga*. But, in fact, according to Bharata what Abhinava calls *uddeśa-vibhāga* is *kārikā*. While taking *kārikā* as an equivalent to Abhinava's *uddeśa-vibhāga*, one should remember the difference between *uddeśa* and *saṅgraha*, which difference we have made clear.

Bharata presents *saṅgraha* immediately after defining it but he does not follow the same method in the case of *kārikā*, that is to say he does not present *kārikā* next to its definition. Immediately after completing the definition of *kārikā* he takes *nirukta* and defines it. The fact is significant and proves something, this we shall discuss a little later.

NIRUKTA DEFINED

BHARATA defines *nirukta* as follows: 'In the places like this, *nirukta* is said to be that where the thing (*artha*, matter or subject) is established along with the explanation of the verbal meaning as it may be able to give a comprehensive understanding of the significance (*samāsenārthasūcakam*), as it may be supported by various established theories (*nānāsiddhāntasādhitam*), as it may be accompanied or accomplished with the derivative meaning (*dhātvarthahetusaṃyukta=vyutpattinimitta*), as it may be supported by lexicons and sciences (*nighaṇṭunigamānvitam*) and as it may be a result of adopting various names or nouns (*nānānāmāśrayotpannam*).' To quote the original:

nānānāmāśrayotpannaṃ nighaṇṭunigamānvitam/
dhātvarthahetusaṃyuktaṃ nānāsiddhāntasādhitam//

sthāpito'rtho bhavedyatra samāsenārthasūcakam/
dhātvarthavacaneneha niruktaṃ tatpracakṣate//[21]

[21] Ibid., pp. 265-6. In these two verses in different places there are several readings noted, but all such things need not be presented here except one, as we accept a different reading from what Abhinava accepts. It has been seen that Abhinava takes *arthasūcakaḥ* to be correct and comments on it with masterly

From the above interpretation it is quite clear that Bharata definitely considers it as a technical term, but Abhinava does not see it as such. As we have noted already, he states on the one hand that it is not a technical term and on the other hand interprets it to be examination, *parīkṣā*, exactly in the manner in which a technical term is defined. This is paradoxical. It seems that the reason for his refusal to accept it as a technical term may be that it is taken to mean a particular thing in works like that of Yāska, while Abhinava sees Bharata's *nirukta* as not the same with that of Yāska. Probably with this reason he refuses to accept Bharata's *nirukta* to be a technical term proper. This is not a correct view, as Bharata need not depend upon Yāska or anyone else for what he wants to say. Bharata may depend on somebody, if he wants to say exactly the same thing as others say. But such is not the case here. Bharata wants to say something, presumably, in his own way. Moreover, he devotes two verses to explain clearly what he means by this. Whether or not such a practice was in vogue in his time is immaterial and as a matter of fact we do not have precise information in the matter.

In this definition certain words like *nighaṇṭu* and *nigama*, which are used in Yāska's *Nirukta*, may appear, yet these do not mean the same as they do in Yāska's *Nirukta*, as such meanings have nothing to do here. The words *nighaṇṭu* and *nigama* are identical in Yāska. These mean nothing here if taken in the same sense, as these are

manipulation. The reading he accepts we cannot. Here the Chow. edn. reads correctly as noted above. In this same place a different reading is noted in the G.O.S. edn. *arthasūtrayoḥ*, but it is obviously wrong.

According to the readings presented above, if these two verses are to be explained in Sanskrit, the explanation would be as follows: *yatrārthaḥ viṣayaḥ dhātvarthavacanena dhātvartho nātra kriyāmātra mapi tu yāvāṃśca dhātuno'cyate tasya vacana miti vivaraṇaṃ tena sākaṃ, samāsena sākalyenārthasūcakaṃ yathā tattvabodhakaṃ syāttathā, yathā ca nānāsiddhāntair lokasiddāntādibhis sādhitaṃ siddhaṃ syāttathā, dhātvarthahetusaṃyuktaṃ dhātvartho'tra vyāpāraḥ tadrūpo yo hetur nimittaṃ tena yukta miti kriyānimittasahitaṃ, evaṃ ca yathā vyutpattinimittasahitaṃ syāttathetyarthaḥ, nighaṇṭunigamānvitaṃ nāsya yāskādiniruktoktarūpo'rthas syāt, apitvitthaṃ syāt, nighaṇṭuḥ kośo nigamā vividhāni śāstrāṇi tadanvita miti tatra-tatroktaviṣayasamarthitaṃ yathā syāttathā, nānānāmāśrayotpannaṃ bahuvidhānāṃ nāmnā māśraya ityāśrayaṇaṃ tenāpi utpannaṃ saṃsiddhaṃ yathā bhavati tathā sthāpitaḥ pratipādito bhavet tat etādṛśeṣu sthaleṣu niruktaṃ pracakṣate budhā iti seṣaḥ.*

found in Yāska. Dramaturgy is not the same to Bharata as is *Veda* to Yāska. Yāska's problem is language, his stress is on etymology. It is for this reason that *nirukta* is known, at least popularly, as etymology. Bharata's problem is dramatic art and he has to define and expound clearly everything that *nāṭya* requires, so his stress naturally is or must be on the subject matter. Bharata clearly indicates by the word *iha* (here) that he is using the word *nirukta* to mean a different thing. The meaning of the words used in Bharata should be determined by their dramaturgic context and intention. Thus considered, the different words of Bharata will be found to mean what has been shown above. In short, *nirukta* in Bharata means definition. Abhinava is not correct when he interprets it to be examination, *parīkṣā*, and considers it not to be a technical term.

In this definition of the definition, so to speak, the important thing is the establishment of the subjects. Then the question comes concerning the process of establishment. This process is shown here mainly through several adverbial phrases. Bharata uses[22] in his work all the methods mentioned in these phrases, but, of course, he does not use all of these everywhere. It is fantastic even to expect

[22] Just for the sake of example it is pointed out here how Bharata utilises these different methods:

(I) He utilises *nānānāmāśrayotpannam* while naming a *rasa* as *śṛṅgāra*, from which topic a few lines are quoted: '*yathā ca gotrakulācārotpannānyāptopadeśasiddhāni puṃsāṃ nāmāni bhavanti tathaiveṣāṃ rasānāṃ bhāvānāṃ ca nāṭyāśritānāṃ cārthānā mācārotpannānyāptopadeśasiddhāni nāmāni bhavanti eva meṣa ācārasiddho hṛdyojvalaveṣātmakatvāt śṛṅgāro rasa iti.*" *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 301.

(II) Similarly he utilises *nighaṇṭunigamānvitam* in some places. Although he does not name any name of *Kośa*, yet he uses *nighaṇṭu* while saying '*bhāvitaṃ vāsitaṃ kṛta mityanarthāntaram*' (ibid., p. 344) '*vibhāvaḥ kāraṇaṃ nimittaṃ hetu riti paryāyāḥ / . . . vibhāvitaṃ vijñāta mityanarthāntaram*' (ibid., p. 346). If the sentence '*vaiśikaśāstrakāraiś ca daśāvastho'bhihitaḥ*' (ibid., p. 309), is reliable, it can be shown as an example for *nigama*.

(III) He utilises *dhātvarthahetusaṃyuktam* in many a good number of places in several ways too: '*abhītyupasargaḥ ṇīñiti dhātuḥ prāpaṇārthaḥ/asyābhinītyevaṃvyavasthitasya erajityacpratyayāntasyābhinaya iti rūpaṃ siddham*' (ibid., Vol. II, Ch. 8, pp. 1-2) '*pṛthivyāṃ nānādeśaveṣabhāṣācārā vārtāḥ prakhyāpayatīti pravṛttiḥ, pravṛttiś ca nivedane*' (ibid., Ch. 13, p. 205, this line is read in different MSS. in defferent ways, but we have amended slightly and quoted here) and so on.

that he should utilise all these means in each and every place. He utilises all of them according to need, or whenever a given method or methods are useful. For these are means to establish the subjects, they cannot be means of examination, as Abhinava describes them. Speaking in a general fashion, examination is a method in establishing the subjects. So it is out of the question to say that the methods described by Bharata in these two verses are methods of examination. *Nirukta*, therefore, is that where the things (*viṣaya*) are established with the aid of different things as mentioned. In short, it is the definition but not an examination.

KĀRIKĀ AND NIRUKTA ARE SHOWN

THUS we have seen what in Bharata's opinion is *kārikā* and what is *nirkuta*. Unlike *saṅgraha*, which he presents immeidately after completing its definition, he does not present them before he has done with the definitions of both. Following a different procedure, he devotes a verse to introduce them. In effect he says: 'I am going to elaborate *saṅgraha* in *kārikā* and in *nirukta*, the *saṅgraha* which has been comprehensively presented by me'. To quote it:

(IV) He utilises *nānāsiddhāntasādhitam* in a number of places: '*lokasiddhānta eṣaḥ yathā sūrya idaṃ dinaṃ nakṣatraṃ vā nayatīti/na ca tena bāhubhyāṃ skandhena vā nīyate/kintu lokaprasiddha metat yathedaṃ sūryo nakṣatraṃ dinaṃ vā nayatīti/eva mete prayogaṃ nayantīti vyabhicāriṇa ityavagantavyā nāma*'/ (Ibid., Vol. I, Ch. 7, p. 356) and '*yathāhi nānāvyañjanauṣadhidravyasaṃyogā drasaniṣpattir bhavati/yathāhi guḍādibhir dravyair vyañjanauṣadhibhiś ca ṣāḍavādayo rasā nirvartyante tathā nānābhāvopagatā api sthāyino bhāvā rasatva māpnuvanti*' (ibid., pp. 287-8). This is an analogy, *dṛṣṭānta*, which can, without dispute, be taken as *siddānta*, so also in several places.

(V) *dhātvartha* is used to serve a different purpose from that of the *dhātvarthahetusaṃyuktam* which has been already dealt with. Unless one specifies the meaning of a given root, any explanation of the derivation of a given word or noun would not be clear at all, because the root may convey a number of meanings (*dhātūnā manekārthatvāt*). Therefore it is necessary to specify the meaning of the root in question. This becomes clear from certain usages of Bharata, e.g. '*rasa iti kaḥ padārthaḥ* (*kasmāt*?) *ucyate āsvādyatvāt*', (Ibid., p. 288). Here he could have said *rasyamānatvāt*, instead he clarifies it with its meaning or a synonym which specifies its meaning. Thus there is a necessity for a special prescription of '*dhātvarthavacana*.' This is utilised by him in most of the places: '*vibhāvo vijñānārthaḥ*' (ibid., p. 346), '*ṇīñiti dhātuḥ prāpaṇārthaḥ*' (ibid., Vol. II, p. 2), '*pravṛttiś ca nivedane*' (ibid., p. 205) and so on.

saṅgraho yo mayā proktaḥ samāsena dvijottamāḥ/
vistaraṃ tasya vakṣyāmi saniruktaṃ sakārikam[23]*//*

It is clear from this, as once pointed out by us, that he considers *saṅgraha* highly important. This is so in the sense that it would form the basis for building up or elaborating the whole theory of dramatic art. Any kind of elaboration, then, invariably depends on this, so also does *kārikā* and *nirukta*. This would be in conformity with his concluding statement at the end of *kārikā* which will be quoted after a while. This introduction as well as the definition of *kārikā* tell the same tale that the things mentioned in *saṅgraha* would be elaborated, in other words, explained a bit in *kārikā*.

Accordingly Bharata gives *kārikā* or presents it in the verses beginning from '*śṛṅgārahāsyakaruṇā raudravīrabhayānakāḥ*' upto the end of the first stanza of the 30th verse, '*caturasro vikṛṣṭaś ca raṅga stryaśraś ca kīrtitaḥ*'.[24] If all these are quoted here they will occupy much space, and we do not lose much if these verses are left out for the present. One can have an idea by seeing the above stanza concerning *raṅga*, how each and every subject mentioned in *saṅgraha* is explained here a bit by way of classifying it. So all these verses need not be quoted here. But it should be noted that among the verses referred to here some stanzas, such as the second stanza of the 28th and first stanza of the 29th verses, and also a stanza in between two stanzas of the 27th verse, are interpolated or unnecessarily read here by some confused persons.

[23] Ibid., Vol., I, Ch. 6, p. 266. Explained in Sanskrit it would run thus: *dvijottamā yas saṅgraho mayā samāsena sākalyena proktas tasya vistaraṃ vakṣyāmi taṃ vipulīkariṣyāmi iti yāvat natu tasya vibhāgaṃ kariṣyāmīti/tadvistara meva viśeṣayati saniruktaṃ sakārika miti/yadvā vipulīkaraṇaprakriyāṃ viśadayati saniruktaṃ sakārika miti viśeṣaṇadvitayamukhena/vistaraṃ kārikāyuktaṃ niruktayuktaṃ ca yathā bhavettathā vakṣyāmīti/yuktatvaṃ ca tadrūpataiva/ evaṃ ca prathamataḥ kārikārūpeṇa tato niruktarūpeṇa ca saṅgrahaṃ vipulīkariṣyāmīti, vipulīkaraṇaṃ viśadīkaraṇā nnānyat, asaṃbhavāt/evaṃ ced viśadīkaraṇamārgau dvau kāriketi niruktaṃ ceti/tata stadubhaya mapyavalambya saṅgrahaṃ viśadīkariṣyāmīti/saṅgraha miti saṅgrahollikhitaviṣayās tā nadhunā kārikārūpo ya eko viśadīkaraṇamārgo yo'nyo niruktamārgaś ca dvāvapi tā vavalambyopadiśāmīti/śloke' tra kārikāyāḥ parataḥ pāṭhaś chandonurodhāt/ prāk kārikayā paścā nniruktena ca vivriyante saṅgrahasamproktā viṣayā ityalam.*

[24] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, pp. 226-70.

After presenting *kārikā*, he concludes it and introduces *nirukta* with the following two statements:

eva meṣo'lpasūtrārtho nirdiṣṭo nāṭyasaṅgrahaḥ/
ataḥ paraṃ pravakṣyāmi sūtragranthavikalpanam//[25]

Of these the first statement lays down that the *nāṭyasaṅgraha* composed of bare things as expounded in *Sūtra*-work has been thus completed. If the importance that Bharata attaches to *saṅgraha* is not realised, this statement may mislead one into thinking that Bharata considers matter (i.e. what we call *kārikā*) described above also to be *saṅgraha*, or its *vibhāga*, as Abhinava assumes. This is not true. We have pointed out repeatedly that Bharata attaches a considerable importance to *saṅgraha*, taking it to be the base of his treatment of different subjects. That is why he describes it specially in a verse *kintvalpasūtragranthārtha*, which he does not do in any other case. Further he presents it immediately after defining it, which also he does not do in any other case. At the same time he mentions definitely *kārikā* and *nirukta* as elaboration (*vistara*) of *saṅgraha* itself. All these facts go to prove the importance he attaches to *saṅgraha*. With the same attitude here, too, he says that this *nāṭya-saṅgraha* has been completed; that does not in any way mean that he considers the above division of the subjects to be *saṅgraha* itself. But, to put it in an explanatory way, what this statement means is that *saṅgraha* which is in *kārikā* form has been completed, that is to say *kārikā* has been completed.

Thus Bharata completes *kārikā*. He next introduces *nirukta* with the other statement quoted above. The second of those is that 'after it (i.e. after completing *saṅgraha* and *kārikā*) I am going to explain *nirukta* (*vikalpanam*) of subjects of *Sūtra*-work (*sūtragrantha*)',[26] in other words the definition of the subjects mentioned in

[25] Ibid., p. 271.

[26] The word, *vikalpanam* in *sūtragranthavikalpanam*, means definition i.e. *nirukta*. It is possible to say this if its derivation is given thus: *vikalpyante niścīyante arthā anena*. The same has been said by us while explaining '*rasabhāvavikalpanam*' (Ibid., p. 261). We have also shown that Abhinava, too, says, the same at some places. The word *grantha* here does not mean a book, but it stands for subject matter, as there would be no meaning in saying the 'definition of a book'. *Sūtra* means a *Śūtra*-work as it always does in this context.

saṅgraha. Speaking thus he starts *nirukta* with the words '*tatra rasā neva tāva dādā vabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ / nahi rasā dṛte kaści darthaḥ pravartate / tatra vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisaṃyogā drasaniṣpattiḥ*'.[27] The *nirukta* is found in the rest of the whole book beginning from the above quoted sentence onwards.

ĀNUVAṂŚYA EXPLAINED

IN the foregoing pages we have seen what are the real meanings of the words—*sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*—which occur in the same context and which are in a way related. Now we shall proceed in our endeavour to find out the meanings of two other words: *ānuvaṃśya* and *nidarśana*.

The word *ānuvaṃśya* is used for the first time after the explanation, also on the basis of an analogy, of *rasa* in the following manner: *atrānuvaṃśyau ślokau bhavataḥ*.[28] There may be a verbal variation in the phrases which introduce these verses throughout the work beginning from this place, but there is no difference in the meaning. The questions connected with this variation will be discussed later on. So far as the meaning of this word goes, there is no dispute among the scholars, ancient and modern.[29] The word *vaṃśa* is used to mean family, which is of two kinds, one is of immediate kin, the second is of learning. Here we are to take the latter meaning, for dramaturgy is a branch of learning. Moreover a teacher may

What all these together mean is that 'the definition i.e. *nirukta* of the subject matters of the *Sūtra*-work, i.e. expounded in that.' This practically means the definition of subject matters mentioned in *saṅgraha*, because *saṅgraha* is defined to consist of those subjects expounded in *Sūtra*-work and also *Bhāṣyā*. Therefore this phrase can be finally taken to mean *saṅgrahaniruktam* or *saṅgraha-proktaviṣayaniruktam*, however it is not the literal meaning. This would be in complete conformity with the statement '*vistaraṃ tasya vakṣyāmi saniruktam sakārikam*.' In no way can Abhinava's interpretation be accepted. In some places, for example at the end of the twenty-eighth Ch. (K.M. edn., p. 453), the phrase *rasabhāvavikalpanam* may be noticed, but in such places one has to decide the question whether or not a paritcular usage is reliable and if found reliable, then one has to give the meaning according to the context.

[27] Ibid., p. 272.

[28] Ibid., p. 289.

[29] S. K. De (see *H.S.P.*, Vol. I, p. 28) and V. Rāghavan (see *N.R.*, p. 11, footnote 1).

teach it to his own son and as well as somebody else's son who becomes his disciple, both of them alike carry it and teach others in their turn. So *ānuvaṃśya* means the things (verses) that come down in a family of learning or pupillary succession. If we are not too particular about its literal meaning, we may translate it as 'traditional' verses, and express its content properly.

There is at present no source available to assert that these were read continuously without any break (*ekapraghaṭṭakatayā*), as is said to be the case with Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. Abhinava, however, says so, the validity of which we have already questioned. S.K. De says: 'These [*ānuvaṃśya* verses] are generally taken from two distinct sources, for some of them are in *Āryā* while the others are in *Anuṣṭup* metre'.[30] Such a conclusion cannot be drawn on so weak a basis as the metre, which cannot, by itself, prove a serious matter of this kind. There are several treatises where different metres especially *ślokas* and *āryās* are used at the discretion of the author or because of convenience. The best example of this would be the *N.Ś.* itself. We notice in the *N.Ś.* that Bharata quotes at the same place *ānuvaṃśyas* composed in *anuṣṭup* and *āryā* metres with the specification of the metre, and we find such *ānuvaṃśyas*, i.e. composed in different metres, dealing with one and the same subject, that is to say, some matters regarding a given subject are expounded in a verse of particular metre while the other matters of the same subject are in a verse of the other metre.[31] This fact certainly proves that all these *ānuvaṃśya* verses written in two metres belong to one and the same work.

NIDARŚANA EXPLAINED

So far as the word *nidarśana* is concerned it is used four times in the sixth and the seventh Chs., twice in each case. Just after the definition of the *rasatva* and before mentioning birth or origin (*utpatti*), colour (*varṇa*), and governing deity (*daivata*) of the *rasas*, Bharata says as an introduction to the latter topic that '*tadeṣāṃ*

[30] *H.S.P.* (De), Vol. I, p.30.

[31] Take, for example, the verses quoted in the *hāsya rasa* topic. It will become clearer from the places like the *moha* definition where Bharata says '*atra śloka stāva dāryā ca*' (*N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 7, p. 362) here *vibhāvas* in *śloka* and *anubhāvas* in *āryā* are given, both of which make a complete definition of *bhāva*, viz. *moha*.

rasānā mutpatti-varṇa-daivata-nidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ'.[32] After completing the *utpatti-varṇa-daivatas* of the *rasas*, Bharata again says as an introduction before defining *rasas* individually that '*idānīṃ vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāri-saṃyuktānāṃ lakṣaṇanidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*'.[33] In the seventh Ch. after completing the *anubhāva* definition he says that '*ato hyeṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ siddhir bhavati tasmā deṣāṃ bhāvānāṃ vibhāvānubhāvasaṃyuktānāṃ lakṣaṇanidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*'.[34] Again, in the same Ch. he says, '*lakṣaṇaṃ khalu pūrva mabhihita meṣāṃ rasasaṃjñakānāṃ nidarśanaṃ tu*'.[35]

In all these cases *nidarśana* means 'evidence' or 'proof' (*pramāṇa*). 'Evidence' may be taken in accordance with context as an earlier authoritative work (*prāktanagranthapramāṇa*) and also as things like logical formulas. The meaning of the word so treated will also fit in places other than the above quoted, e.g. '*antaranidarśana mapi vyākhyātam*' and '*antaranidarśana mapi śrutinidarśane proktam*'. This is quite clear from Bharata's two usages, viz. '*nidarśanaṃ tvāsā mabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*/ *yathā—dve vīṇe*' and '*eva menena śrutinidarśanena dvaigrāmikyo dvāviṃśatiśrutayaḥ pratyavagantavyāḥ*'.[36] In the present context we are to take *nidarśana* to mean 'earlier authority'. The 'earlier authority' that Bharata refers to is nothing but *ānuvaṃśya* verses. It is definite that *ānuvaṃśya* verses are quoted by Bharata as an authority in the matters dealt with in his own prose passages. This is proved by his use everywhere of the word *atra* with the meaning 'in this matter', i.e. in the matters said in prose passages. To put it more clearly, Bharata means by it that what he says in the prose passages is based on earlier texts, so it is evidenced by them. This would find further support if the contents of the prose passages and the *ānuvaṃśya* verses are compared. Essentially and practically they are the same, although in some places some

[32] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 294. It means *rasānā mutpattir varṇo daivataś ceti ya ete trayas tān teṣāṃ trayāṇāṃ yāni nidarśanāni pramāṇāni ca vyākhyāsyāma ityarthaḥ/evaṃ ca ya utpattivarṇadaivatās te sanidarśanā vakṣyanta iti yāvat//*

[33] Ibid., p. 299.

[34] Ibid., p. 348.

[35] Ibid. (first edn.) p. 351. The second edn. and the Chow. edn. do not read this word, *nidarśanaṃtu*. This is more correct. Even if it is necessary the particle *tu* should be corrected as *ca* or be taken to mean *samuccaya*.

[36] Ibid. (K.M. edn.), Ch. 28, pp. 433-5.

additional matters are said in the prose passages. This is natural since the prose passages are later than *ānuvaṃśyas*, so that they may contain some additional matters.[37] But, as we have seen, Abhinava puts forward a view quite opposite to this, interpreting *kārikā* as *ānuvaṃśya* verse, and the *ānuvaṃśya* to have contained some kind of explanation of what has been said in Bharata's prose passages. This is absurd. If the essence is the same in both of these, i.e. prose passages and *ānuvaṃśyas*, why then does Bharata quote the *ānuvaṃśyas*? The answer is quite simple, he quotes them to support his position, of which fact the word *nidarśana* is a verbal expression. Therefore, *nidarśana* means evidence or proof (*pramāṇa*).

Although literally the word *nidarśana* may mean several things, yet any meaning other than 'evidence' would not fit in with the present context. The meaning 'individual definition' which Abhinava gives, is not among its well-known meanings. There is no necessity to force such a far-fetched meaning here, also it is not a suitable meaning for the following reasons. If it means individual definition, there is no need to use it before *utpattivarṇa-daivatas*, as it is not the place for it. If, somehow or other, it is accepted, there would not have been any necessity to mention it again just before starting to define *rasas* individually. If at all Bharata means by it the individual definition, he should have then mentioned *rasa* and *bhāva* in the singular and said *etasya rasasya nidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ, etasya bhāvasya nidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. But in fact he mentions them in the plural (*see* quotations 1 to 3 given above). This shows that Bharata does not mean 'individual definition' by the word *nidarśana* as Abhinava interprets. Apart from this, Bharata mentions it along with the word *lakṣaṇa* in the second quotation, i.e. in the place, from where he is going to define *rasas* individually; he does not use the word, *lakṣaṇa*, and uses only *nidarśana* in the first quotation, i.e. before dealing with *utpatti-varṇa-daivatas*. This is significant and indicates that Bharata means by them quite different things neither of which qualify the other. Somehow Abhinava does not take this into serious consideration. By taking *lakṣaṇanidarśana* as

[37] S.K. De says that the *ānuvaṃśya* verses are quoted by Bharata 'in support of or in supplement to his own statements', *H.S.P.*, Vol. II, pp. 19-20. We are not one with him so far as he says 'in supplement', as there is no incident to show this and Bharata's intention is not such.

a compound word the meaning Abhinava gives to it is also of a fantastic nature. But the use of the words *lakṣaṇa* and *nidarśana* together prove that Bharata does not mean by it 'individual definition'. Therefore, it is quite correct to think, as we have said, that the word *nidarśana* means evidence.

There is no doubt about[38] the matter that Bharata uses the word *nidarśana* to mean 'evidence' or proof, and the 'evidence' (*prāktana-granthapramāṇa*) he shows here is nothing but *ānuvaṃśya* verses. It means that the purpose of his quoting *ānuvaṃśya* verses is to support what he says. This conclusion can be arrived at from Bharata's quoting of *ānuvaṃśyas*. As has been mentioned, it is generally accepted that the *ānuvaṃśyas* which Bharata introduces in his text are prior to him, then he should have quoted them either to criticise the views recorded in them or to support himself, there is no third purpose. Bharata expressly criticises some views,[39] but nowhere can one find him raising the slightest objection against the contents of *ānuvaṃśyas* which is positive proof that he quotes them in order to support himself. Moreover, he always introduces them with the remarks *atrānuvaṃśyāḥ*, etc. Therefore *nidarśana* can only mean evidence and he quotes *ānuvaṃśyas* in order to support himself.

[38] Bharata, who includes the word *nidarśana* in the introductory remarks of *utpatti-varṇa-daivatas* (viz. *rasānā mutpattidaivatanidarśanānyabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*), does not mention in their concluding remarks which run thus: '*eva meteṣāṃ rasānā mutpattivarṇadaivatānyabhivyākhyātāni*'. Further he does not use this word before *rasatva* and *bhāvatva* definitions. One may, therefore, argue that Abhinava's interpretation of this word to mean 'individual definition' is correct. But, indeed, it is not true as shown by various other factors. Moreover even after completing the definitions of individual *rasas* and also *bhāvas* Bharata does not mention this word while concluding them. Similarly he does not also mention it after *utpattivarṇadaivatas* are completed. In fact, there is no such necessity. So it does not prove Abhinava's interpretation to be correct. So far as the second point goes, Bharata does not mention it before *rasatva* and *bhāvatva* definition because of the method or way with which he usually starts and proceeds. This will be quite clear from the context. So, this point also is not a serious one and it does not in any way prove Abhinava's interpretation to be correct.

[39] E.g. '*kiṃ rasebhyo bhāvānā mabhinirvṛtti rutāho bhāvebhyo rasānā miti ucyate, keṣāñcinmataṃ parasparasambandhā deṣa mabhinirvṛtti riti/tanna/kasmāt, dṛśyate hi bhavebhyo rasānā mabhinirvṛtti riti natu rasebhyo bhāvānā mabhinirvṛtti riti*' *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 292.

RESUMÉ OF THE WORD-MEANINGS

THUS, we have seen in some detail, what are the real meanings of the seven words proposed for discussion in this work. The conclusions arrived at are almost in all cases quite different from those of Abhinava. To sum up:

1. *Sūtra* means an earlier work on dramatic art in *sūtra* (aphorism) form, and it does not at all mean a part of prose passages of the *N.Ś.* itself.
2. *Bhāṣya* means an authentic commentary on the earlier *Sūtra*-work, but not at all another part of the prose passages of the *N.Ś.*
3. *Saṅgraha* means a comprehensive list of the subjects, just by name, the subjects which are dealt with in earlier works — *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* — on it.
4. *Kārikā*, the displayer of things (*artha*), is that where the things are said comprehensively in accordance with the *Sūtra*-work with a bit of explanation.
5. *Nirukta* is that where the things are established by various means (mentioned in adverbial phrases) along with the clarification of the root meanings. So it means definition but not examination.
6. *Ānuvaṃśya* means the traditional verses quoted by Bharata in the *N.Ś.*
7. *Nidarśana* means evidence or proof (*pramāṇa*) and this evidence shown by Bharata is nothing but *ānuvaṃśya* verses.

Three among these seven words, viz. *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*, are used quite technically, about which there should not be any doubt, as these are defined with the help of a verse devoted to each of them. We do not know whether there are any words in English which more or less convey the same meanings with similar shades. So it is rather difficult for us to translate them or give equivalents in English. But by way of suggestion we should like to mention repertorium or repertory, inventorium or inventory, and definitorium or definition as equivalents of *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta* respectively. Our suggestion of the word inventory for *kārikā* is based on its literal meaning which is given in the dictionaries

as 'detailed list'. In fact it is not a very satisfactory word. A suggestion for more adequate and precise words would be quite welcome.

RECONSIDERATION OF THE MEANINGS

Before considering the results of our new interpretation of these seven words, it is necessary to clarify further certain matters regarding the meanings of a few of these words.

We differ considerably with our predecessors over the interpretation of the word, *sūtra.* All of them take it to mean a part of prose passages of the *N.Ś.*, while we have interpreted it to mean a separate and older *Sūtra*-work. To interpret it thus one need not depend upon any external evidence, as it is quite clear from the *N.Ś.* itself. Bharata clearly says that a comprehensive (*samāsena*) composition (*nibandha*) of the things said in the *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* is *saṅgraha*. Here if we take *sūtra* to be the defining sentence and *bhāṣya* an explanation of it, both of which are recorded in prose passages of the *N.Ś.*, it would certainly lead to absurdity. An original work and a commentary on it, although they may be written by one author, cannot make a single work. So, if we accept the prose passages of the *N.Ś.* to consist of two items, viz. *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*, we are at the same time to accept that prose passages of the *N.Ś.* are two separate works. Such can never be the case, because the first and second parts of the prose passages are inseparable. Apart from it, *bhāṣya* is never inserted in the middle of the original. Thirdly, if we take *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* to be in the prose passages it means that the *saṅgraha* is concerned only with the subjects dealt with in those prose passages, as Bharata defines *saṅgraha*, in some sense or the other, to be *uddeśa* of things explained in *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*, but that is not the case. There are hundreds of things in the *N.Ś.* which are not at all discussed in the prose passages, details of *āṅgikābhianaya*, for example, are not discussed in prose, while each and every *rasa* and *bhāva* is discussed. And we cannot, or must not, say that the *saṅgraha* is not concerned with such subjects which are not expounded in prose. Therefore the *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* here do not at all mean parts of prose passages

of the *N.Ś.*, but they certainly mean different things. If so what else can they mean? They certainly mean separate works from the *N.Ś.* The word *bhāṣya* proves the existence of *Sūtra*-work and the latter does the same for the former. Therefore the *sūtra* and *bhāṣya* mentioned by Bharata in this context can only mean works older than the *N.Ś.* As we have said, to draw this conclusion we need not, in fact, depend upon any external evidence and Pāṇini's mention of two *Naṭasūtra* works may be taken to be the external evidence of this about which we shall discuss later.

Regarding *bhāṣya* something has already been said. From Patañjali's *Mahābhāṣya* we know that there existed the practice of writing *bhāṣyas* as early as second century B.C. It is possible to write *bhāṣyas* on other *sūtra* works also. Therefore one need not hesitate to say that there was a *Bhāṣya* on *Sūtra*-work mentioned by Bharata.

So far as *saṅgraha* goes, it is an *uddeśa*, but, of course, as pointed out already, not in the sense in which it is understood in the later age and today too. There may be certain incidents of later or earlier times where *uddeśa* is mentioned as *saṅgraha*, yet it has to be seen whether there is any practice of understanding *saṅgraha* exactly in the sense in which Bharata specifies or defines it. Nevertheless, we need not wait for such a discovery, because it is quite clear from the *N.Ś.* in what sense Bharata takes it. In fact, to try to investigate the matter whether there is any similar incident would be an act of satisfying curiosity, but it cannot be a necessity. There may not be any such practice and Bharata himself may be responsible or may have wanted to specify it in his own way. In that case we may not also find any similar such incidents. Still Bharata's definition remains unquestionable, as he says quite clearly what he wants to say.

Regarding *kārikā* also there should not be any doubt. We have already pointed out that in the definition of *kārikā* two compound words are significant, viz. *arthapradarśinī* and *alpābhidhānena*. In Rājaśekhara's *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* also *kārikā* is said in this way: '*arthapradarśanakārikā kārikā*'.[40] By this we can know that those words are used as late as the end of the ninth century A.D. From medieval ages *kārikā* stands for an epitome of the things discussed at length in *Sūtras* and *Bhāṣyas* or such works. In this sense

[40] *K.M.*, Ch. 3, p. 5.

they contain all the necessary details of a given theory without much discussion that is meant to refute opposing views. Because of it this too is called memorial verse. In this sense also it can be described as *arthapradarśinī*. Here a difficulty arises, as there is no further clarification, as to in what sense Rājaśekhara uses this phrase. Taking into consideration his time, we may assume that he uses this phrase in the medieval sense, i.e. memorial verse, but it cannot be finally decided thus. Bharata uses *arthapradarśinī*, but he certainly means *arthapradarśana* in a particular or definite way, viz. *alpābhidhāna*. And this *alpābhidhāna* again should be taken in a restricted way. Here it means just the splitting up implicitly of the subjects of *saṅgraha*. That spliting up cannot be done at will, and it should follow *Sūtra*-work. Though in Bharata's concept and also in the latter concept, *kārikā* is *arthapradarśinī*, yet there is a difference in the ways in which the matters are presented or displayed. The question whether such a concept was prevalent in Bharata's time, or is it his own concept, is to be investigated, as in the case of *saṅgraha*, only in order to satisfy our craving for origins, but not in order to decide the meaning of Bharata's definition of *kārikā*, because the meaning is quite clear as we have interpreted.

As regards *nirukta* what Bharata says is different from what is understood from the word *nirukta* used by Yāska. In Bharata's opinion *nirukta* is nothing but a definition (*nirvacana*) of a certain subject with the aid of different devices. The same is also the popular sense of the word. The difference between Bharata and Yāska is due to the subject matter with which they are concerned. Yāska's task ends with deciding the nature of the word with its literal meaning, for which etymology is a vital aid, if not the sole means. Whereas in the case of Bharata etymology as well as literal meaning are just means, and the clear establishment of subject matters required by *nāṭya* is the sole aim. In any case, Bharata's *nirukta* can never be an examination (*parīkṣā*), as Abhinava thinks.[41]

[41] In K.M. there are two sentences concerning *sūtra* and *bhāṣya*: '*tatrasūtraṇāt sūtram/ ākṣipyabhāṣaṇā dbhāṣyam*', p. 5. We have already seen that Abhinava, too, says the same.

PART III

NEW LIGHT ON SOME TEXTUAL PROBLEMS OF THE NATYASASTRA

INTRODUCTION

IN Part II we have seen what are the meanings of the seven words in the *N.Ś.* We have also naturally seen the propriety of the meanings which we have ascribed to the words: *sūtra*, *bhāṣya*, *saṅgraha*, *kārikā* and *nirukta*. This means that till now we could complete only those problems which are concerned with determining the meanings of the seven words. Now it is to be seen whether this new interpretation may not throw some light on other and allied problems, such as the chronology of the works on dramatic art of the pre-Bharata period, the method and scope of introducing *ānuvaṃśya* verses, later additions or interpolations into the original text of the *N.Ś.*, recension, date and authorship of the *N.Ś.* and so on. So we are now to turn to these questions and discuss them one by one.

CHRONOLOGY OF WORKS OF THE PRE-BHARATA PERIOD

THE discussion in the foregoing pages — Part II of this work — has led to the following conclusion. There existed a *Sūtra*-work long before Bharata and there was also a *Bhāṣya* written on it. The subjects included in *saṅgraha* must follow the subjects dealt with in the *Sūtra-work* and *Bhāṣya*. *Kārikā* displays the subjects mentioned in *saṅgraha* in the way of a bit of explanation and the display of the things must follow *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*. The things as split up in *kārikā* are to be defined, so *nirukta* also should follow *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*. Therefore every thing said in the *N.Ś.* is in principle based on *Sūtra*-work or, to put it differently, the sole source of the *N.Ś.* is *Sūtra*-work. This does not necessarily mean that Bharata just copies every detail from *Sūtra*-work. There might have been a lot of development in between these two, but

we do not have any material to trace the actual development. What one should precisely understand here is that all the subjects mentioned in *saṅgraha* are dealt with in *Sūtra*-work in some form or the other, as is evidenced by Bharata's definition of *saṅgraha*. The science of drama was in vogue much earlier than Bharata. This is proved not only by *ānuvaṃśya* verses quoted by Bharata, but also from the Patañjali's statement '*rasiko naṭaḥ*.'[1] There are several statements in it to prove the practice of drama in his time, i.e. the second century B.C., and we have discussed this elsewhere.[2] In fact the *N.Ś.* is a landmark in the development of drama, dramatic science and *nṛtya*. This is clear from several matters. But there is no doubt that in the main the *N.Ś.* traces its origin back to an older *Sūtra*-work.

The second important point in our conclusion is that Bharata quotes *ānuvaṃśya* verses as an ancient authority (*nidarśana=prāktanagranthapramāṇa*) in order to support himself, and not for any other purpose. This is proved also by the adoption of prose in his work, the *N.Ś.*, which is otherwise written only in verse. Whenever he wants to quote *ānuvaṃśyas*, he adopts prose. But the prose passages are not necessarily followed by *ānuvaṃśya* verses (this will be shown later). Here it seems that he adopts prose for two reasons. One is that he would be quite free in using certain additional words and elaborating the definitions, if he adopts prose. Secondly, the authority which he quotes is in verse, if it followed his own verses with the same contents, it would lead to monotony. By adopting prose he can avoid tediousness. Thus his use of prose would serve a double purpose. This is applicable only in the case of those prose passages that are followed, or rather should be followed, by *ānuvaṃśya* verses, but is not the same case with others. (This distinction will be shown later on.) Perhaps with these reasons, he adopts prose. There is no other explanation for his adoption of prose only in certain places or rather selected places. Thus, also, his adoption of prose proves that Bharata quotes the *ānuvaṃśya* verses in order to support himself.

Such a conclusion leads to a further point. Bharata, who expresses, at least in the definition of *saṅgraha* and *kārikā*, that these are based

[1] *M.B.*, 5-2-95.

[2] *N: T.M.R.*, p. 26.

on *Sūtra*-work, actually quotes neither from *Sūtra*-work nor passages of *Bhāṣya*. It cannot be said that existing prose passages themselves comprise ancient *sūtras* and *bhāṣya* on them because they do not show any such tendencies. On the contrary, as we have already said, they definitely seem to be one work. Above all, there would be no meaning in quoting *ānuvaṃśyas* if these prose passages were really comprising ancient *sūtras* and *bhāṣya* on them, since the latter two are an earlier authority than the *ānuvaṃśyas* and there would have been no necessity to quote regularly two or more authorities. So the prose passages themselves are not the ancient *sūtras* and *bhāṣya* on them. It is certain that instead of ancient *sūtras* and *bhāṣya* on them he quotes *ānuvaṃśya ślokas* or *āryās* in many places with this name (i.e. *ānuvaṃśya śloka* or *āryā*) and in other places with some other similar phrases definitely with the same meaning. Above all once he describes *ānuvaṃśyas* to be *sūtrārthānuviddha*. Thus in no circumstances *ānuvaṃśya śloka* or *āryā* means either of these, i.e. *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya*. Therefore *ānuvaṃśya* verses are, no doubt, separate from *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*. Why does he quote *ānuvaṃśyas* instead of *sūtras* or *bhāṣya* saying at the same time that he bases his work on *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*? Here the plausible reply would be that *ānuvaṃśya* verses themselves are written by some authentic *Acārya* or *Acāryas* on the basis of both — *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*. And all the essential matters said in the *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya* are faithfully recorded in them. This is quite clear from Bharata's introductory remarks that 'here are also two *āryās* tied with the meaning of the *sūtras*' (*apicātra sūtrārthānuviddhe ārye bhavataḥ*).[3] This

[3] A number of readings are found in this place. The Chow. edn. reads *apicātra sūtrārthānuvaddhe ārye bhavataḥ* (p. 74) here *va* seems to be a printing mistake for *vi* or *ba* and the K.M. edn. reads with *ba*. If we come to the G.O.S. (first edn. p. 312) four readings can be noticed in it, such as (*i*) *sūtrānubandhe* (*ii*) *sūtrārthānuviddha* (*iii*) *sūtrānuvidhe* (*iv*) *anuvaṃśye*. The first among them might be the scribe's mistake or somebody who is under the impression that these are supplied as additional matters, might have corrected *anubadha* to be *anubandha*. But these cannot be *anubandha* as these do not give any matters not said in Bharata's own words in general. The second one is used by Abhinava, but the editor of this edn. supplies in the body *sūtrānuviddhe* for which the reason is not known. The third one is obviously mistaken for *sūtrānuviddhe*. The fourth one also is incorrect, as it means nothing, if read along with the word *sūtra*. From this discussion it has become clear that any one of the three

proves two things — one that *Sūtra* is a separate work older than Bharata, and, secondly, that *ānuvaṃśyas* are verses which record faithfully the same things expounded in the *Sūtra*-work. *Sūtra* as such cannot be taken to mean Bharata's sentence written in prose, for that would lead to absurdity. As *ānuvaṃśyas* record faithfully the things established in *Sūtra*-work, people concerned with dramatic art accept them and begin to study them generation after generation. Further the Indians' love for verse and the metre which helps in commiting them by heart might have made the people learn them more enthusiastically. Also *ānuvaṃśyas* might have been more popular than *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*, on both of which these are based. The word *ānuvaṃśya* itself proves their popularity. Perhaps these verses gain or get the name *ānuvaṃśya* later on, for it seems quite improbable that they should have been so called at the time of their original composition. Thus *ānuvaṃśya* cannot be an original name, and it positively indicates their popularity. Bharata, too, might have quoted them owing to their popularity as well as authenticity. His preference for these verses to *sūtras* and passages of *Bhāṣya* does not cause any absurdity or impropreity, since these verses presumably record every essential matter of *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya* faithfully and it makes practically no difference, if he quotes either *sūtras* or *ānuvaṃśyas*. So we may come to a conclusion that Bharata quotes *ānuvaṃśya* verses as an authority instead of *sūtras* and *Bhāṣya*, even though he says expressly that his work is based on *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya*.

Taking their position as basis we may say tentatively or by way of suggestion that these are the *vārtikas*. For some reason or the other if these cannot be called *vārtikas*, even then, there is no doubt that

following readings, *sūtrānubaddhe*, *sūtrāthānuviddhe* and *sūtrānuviddhe*, can stand as a correct one. These three readings make no difference in their meaning, but the second one is obviously preferable, as it is more clear.

Here Abhinava says this much: '*sūtrārthānuviddhe yāvadārye apītyapicetyasya bhinnakramasyārthaḥ*' *A.B.*, Vol. I, p. 312. From our previous discussion it is clear what meaning he gives to the *sūtra*, he, however, does not mention anything here. He means Bharata's sentence written in prose. So his interpretation is not acceptable for the reasons mentioned previously. M.M. Ghosh translates this as follows: 'There are besides two *Āryās* related to the preceding *sūtra*', E.T. of the *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, p. 109. For the same reasons this, too, needs correction.

these serve the same purpose as *Yogavārtika*, etc. Therefore S. K. De is not quite correct when he declares *ānuvaṃśyas* to 'correspond to the *parikara* or *saṅgraha ślokas* in later writings',[4] because the purpose of *parikaras* and *vārtikas* is different.

From the above discussion we may deduce the following chronological order of the dramaturgic works uptill the *N.Ś.* The first and original work is a *Sūtra*-work of an unknown author and, secondly, a *Bhāṣya* on the said *Sūtra*-work, also of unknown authorship. The third work is the *ānuvaṃśyas* based on the above two works — *Sūtra*-work and *Bhāṣya* — and which *ānuvaṃśyas* we tentatively treat as *vārtikas*. Their authorship also is not known to us. Lastly comes our present text, Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra*, whose origin, at least in regard to the principal matters, is traceable to *Sūtra*-work and in which *ānuvaṃśyas* are quoted as an authority. Although we get this chronological order, still it is a problem again to fix their exact dates, as at present we do not have enough evidence. In the circumstances if anything about their date is to be said, we have no other way but to depend on hypothesis. Inferring from the nature of the works that each of them came into existence, roughly speaking, two hundred years after the work immediately preceding it, we may say that approximately a period of six hundred years elapses between *Sūtra*-work and the *Nāṭyaśāstra*.

Apart from this we have nothing new to offer at present on the date of the *N.Ś.* Scholars hold divergent views on this point, putting it somewhere in the period beginning from the fifth century B.C. to the fifth century A.D. We need not enter into the details of the matter. Many scholars tend to fix its date, or at least the date of the beginnings of its writing, in the second or at least the third century A.D. So long as one depends on the text as available in print there may be good reasons in support of this date. But the time has not yet come to fix a definite date for the *N.Ś.* For the sake of convenience one may provisionally accept this date, i.e. the second century A.D. The date of *Sūtra*-work mentioned in the *N.Ś.* can, therefore, be assumed on this basis to be the fifth or the fourth century B.C.

One might mention here Pāṇini's reference to two *Naṭasūtra*

[4] *H.S.P.* (De), Vol. I, p. 30.

works — of Śilāli and Kṛśāśva — in his *vyākaraṇsūtras*: '*pārāśarya-śilālibhyāṃ bhikṣunaṭasūtrayoḥ*' and '*karmanda-kṛśāśvādiniḥ.*'[5] But as to the meaning of *naṭa* in the compound word, *Naṭasūtras*, there is plenty of controversy among modern scholars. Some even find in these appelations a touch of ridicule from which they deduce that even in those early ages *naṭas* as well as those who are connected with their art had no respectable place in society. We need not enter into these details. For our purpose it will suffice to mention the controversy briefly. One section of scholars does not admit that *nāṭa* means 'actor' and they insist that it means only 'dancer' (*nartaka*), while the other section of scholars say that it means nothing but 'actor'. But no scholar realises the fact that from Bharata's *N.Ś.* itself *Naṭasūtras* can be traceable — *Naṭasūtras* which, being the source of the *N.Ś.*, can mean nothing but a treatise on drama. As late as the fifth century A.D. Amarasiṃha, the earliest of the known Sanskrit lexicographers, gives *śailālins*, *kṛśāśvins*, *naṭas* and some other words as synonyms.[6] It is definite that in his time *naṭa* was understood as an actor. It is a proof of the fact that *Naṭasūtras* referred to by Pāṇini are concerned with dramaturgy. Considering the time that had elapsed between Pāṇini and Amarasiṃha and the development that might have taken place in the sphere of dramatic art, we may not put much weight on the lexicographer. But we can hardly deny the evidence of the *N.Ś.* in determining the meaning of the word *naṭa* to be actor, *naṭa* which is of *Naṭasūtras* referred to by Pāṇini.

There are unfortunately no sure grounds for fixing Pāṇini's date either. But so far as it is possible scholars have tried to assign a date for him, viz. the fourth century B.C. Hypothetically we have also arrived at a conclusion regarding the date of the *Sūtra*-work traceable from the *N.Ś.*, which date at least corresponds with Pāṇini's age, if not precedes it. Again Pāṇini's mention of *Naṭasūtras* may be taken to be external evidence for the assumption that *Sūtra*-work mentioned by Bharata existed long before the beginnings of the Christian era. Thus these two works — *Naṭasūtras* mentioned by

[5] A. 4-3-110, 111.

[6] '*śailālinastu śailūṣā jāyājīvā kṛśāśvinaḥ/ bharatā ityapi naṭāḥ*', A.K., *Kāṇḍa* II, *śūdravarga* 12.

Pāṇini and *Sūtra*-work utilised by Bharata — mutually strengthen each other in certain matters.

As regards *Naṭasūtras* mentioned by Pāṇini the following points deserve looking into. From the nature of things we may take it for granted that Śilāli and Kṛśāśva are not contemporaries of Pāṇini. Apart from this he reads the two *sūtras* (quoted above) under the *adhikārasūtra*, '*tena proktam*', which does not seem to be taken into account by the scholars. Here the word *prokta* does not, according to Patañjali and others, mean either 'done' or 'composed', but it means 'disclosed'. It is, then, obvious that Śilāli and Kṛśāśva just disclose the works which already existed before them. Thus according to this account the material expounded in those two *Naṭasūtra* works goes far back from Pāṇini's time. From the historical point of view whatever may be the value of this kind of interpretation of the word *prokta*, it is beyond doubt that the dramaturgic science existed long before Pāṇini. The second point to note here is Pāṇini's mention of these *Naṭasūtras* along with the works which are generally revered by the people. A grammarian is mainly concerned with suffixes, prefixes, and so on, rather than with social conditions of the day and so his mention of certain subjects along with others may not prove any other serious things. Nevertheless, if we take into account all the matters mentioned under this *adhikārasūtra*, it seems that the entire content has a significance over and above the purely grammatical. That is why it is difficult to agree with those scholars who find an ironical significance in the appellations Śilāli and Kṛśāśva.

From the above discussion it has become clear that *Sūtra*-work mentioned by Bharata and the *Naṭasūtra* works referred to by Pāṇini are of pre-Pāṇini date, i.e. traceable more or less to the same period. In spite of this, we are not at present able to identify them, because of the lack of evidence. It would be too much to say that Bharata's use of *sūtra-bhāṣyayoḥ* stands for two or more *Sūtra*-works as well as *Bhāṣyas*. It is the subject matter for future investigation whether the *Sūtra*-work utilised by Bharata is separate from those two referred to by Pāṇini, if not, then which of the two—of Śilāli and of Kṛśāśva—is it that Bharata follows.

While the chronology of pre-Bharata dramaturgic literature is traceable in this way, S.K. De deduces very different results. His views on this subject are best presented in his own words:

'.. we are confronted with the problem of the inter-relation of these apparent survivals in our text [i.e. *N.Ś.*], which contains vestiges of (1) independent prose-fragments (2) *Ānuvaṃśya ślokas* in *āryā* and *Anuṣṭup* meters and (3) *Sūtra-bhāṣya* style, as well as (4) the present systematic *Kārikās*.

We can, therefore, distinguish in their order of development (1) a stage of prose-treatises (2) a tentative period of *Kārikā*-writing (3) the *Sūtra-bhāṣya* stage and (4) the final period of compilation of compendium, which reverts again to the *Kārikā* form'.[7]

As we have seen in the foregoing pages, the meanings which De gives to the different words used by Bharata are far from acceptable. No other evidence, then, is necessary to disprove the chronology traced by him.

METHOD OF QUOTING ĀNUVAṂŚYAS

Now that the chronology of the dramaturgic works of the pre-Bharata period has been traced, we shall pass on to the topic of the method and scope of introducing *ānuvaṃśya* verses. We shall first concentrate on the method, for it will help us to some extent in the further discussion. Here it should be noted that we confine ourselves in this matter to the greater part of the text, leaving only the portion beginning from the twenty-nineth Ch. to the end of the text, reasons for this will be given later.

Bharata introduces *ānuvaṃśyas* for the first time with these words: *atrānuvaṃśyau ślokau*[8], and this phrase is repeated now and then. It should be noted that the use of the word *ānuvaṃśya* is significant here because it is the first occassion for him to quote them. No matter if the word is not always repeated, because by other means *ānuvaṃśyas* are pointed out and if once the reader becomes aware of the fact by the above usage, he will be able to recognise *ānuvaṃśyas* through the other usages or phrases too. The most frequent indicative wordings are *bhavanti cātra ślokāḥ*,[9] *atrārye bhavataḥ*,[10] etc., on few occasions *atra ślokaḥ*,[11] and *atrāryāḥ*.[12]

[7] *H.S.P.* (De), Vol. I, pp. 30-31.
[8] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, p. 289.
[9] Ibid., p. 292.
[10] Ibid., p. 318.
[11] Ibid., p. 350.
[12] Ibid., p. 326.

By this we can understand that in his way of introduction two words are essential, viz. *atra* and either *śloka* or *āryā*. We cannot reduce them further. In the print we can also see the single word *atra* only, but it is extremely rare. Even if the various readings noticed in all the MSS. are taken into consideration, its occurrence is quite rare. Its typical example is (*teṣā mutpattihetavaś catvāro rasāḥ / tadyathā śṛṅgāro raudro vīro bībhastsa iti /*) *atra—śṛṅgārāddhi bhaveddhāsyo*[13] etc. A point which should be mentioned is that Bharata never uses *tatra* and *atra* indiscriminately to introduce *ānuvaṃśyas*, in other words, before quoting earlier texts in order to show an authority, as later people do without any distinction. Bharata uses *tatra* when he enters into detail after a general statement, while he uses *atra* (in this matter) to quote earlier authority. This explanation in regard to the *tatra* should, of course, be taken to be a broad one and different shades of its meanings are noticed from the *N.Ś.* itself and we need not enter into any such detail. But it is quite certain that Bharata always uses *atra* in places like these to indicate the quotations. After this clarification we may come to a conclusion. It can be assumed on the basis of its extreme rarity that originally there was, as usual, either the word *śloka* or *āryā* along with the word *atra* and somehow it disappeared afterwards, so now we may supply such a word. This conclusion not only tells a fact but also can work as one of the factors in deciding the nature of some verses suspected to be *ānuvaṃśyas*.

The next question is whether the particle *ca*, quite often met with here, denotes something of its own, e.g. the meaning 'also' or is it just a euphonic usage. If it gives the meaning, 'also' then the whole sentence should mean that 'there are also traditional verses in this matter'. But this 'also' is not essential, and in fact Bharata does not find it necessary. His method of quoting those verses does not show any signs of his attaching any significance to the particle *ca*. If so, it is clear that the use of *ca* is merely euphonic. This conclusion is supported by a considerable number of sentences, (as for example those quoted already) seen without any traces of *ca* (*atra ślokāḥ, atra āryāḥ, bhavati ślokaḥ*, etc.). This is further supported by other

[13] Ibid., p. 395.

kind of sentences where the verb (*bhavati* or *bhavanti*) is included before the word *atra.* In this type of sentence *yaṇādeśasandhi* is deliberately avoided, e.g. *bhavati cātra ślokaḥ.*[14] If the order of the words is changed *ca* is not used, e.g., *atra śloko bhavati.*[15] If a few readings are seen with *yaṇādeśasandhi*, they are rare and only to be found in the variants, so that we can take them without any hesitation as incorrect, and neglect such stray incidents. Taken together these facts prove that *yaṇādeśasandhi* is intentionally avoided by adding the particle *ca*, which means *ca* is euphonically used and in most places it does not denote any meaning at all. Why most the places? Because it is seen also to denote the meaning, 'and' or 'also', e.g. '*atra śloka stāvadāryā ca*'.[16] Occasions like this are of course very few. Obviously occasions of a similar nature are quite different from the above quoted, because here *ānuvaṃśyas* written in two different meters are being used for a single purpose where a conjunction is badly needed. After these facts are presented, we can conclude that *ca*, when it is used to give some meaning, denotes 'and' only. On all other occasions, insofar as they are concerned with the introduction of *ānuvaṃśya* verses, it does not at all mean that 'there are *also* traditional verses in this matter'. That is to say, it is euphonically used. There are some other usages, e.g., *ślokāś cātra*,[17] which are accompanied by *ca* and where there is no scope for *yaṇādeśasandhi.* To pronounce two successive vowels is comparatively difficult. So, to make it easier, here *ca* is added without attaching any specific meaning to it. Thus this type of usages also further prove quite clearly the fact that *ca* is euphonically used.

We have seen that Bharata does not find it necessary to convey things like 'also' by *ca.* With the help of this conclusion it is not difficult now to understand the validity of some other similar words or usages, such as *api*, *bhavatyapi*, etc. We shall first give some incidents of this kind found in the printed texts. All the three edns. unanimously read *apica* to introduce *ānuvaṃśyas* in a place.[18] But in the G.O.S. (first edn., p. 311) in the same place another reading

[14] Ibid., pp. 348, 350, 351, etc.
[15] Ibid., pp. 371, 372, 373, 374, etc.
[16] Ibid., p. 362.
[17] Ibid., p. 345.
[18] Ibid., p. 310; K.M., p. 96; Chow., p. 74.

bhavati cātra ślokaḥ, is noted. In another place the K.M. edn. reads *apica*[19] while the Chow. edn. reads in the same place *api ca ślokaḥ*[20] and the G.O.S. edn. reads *bhavatyapi ca*,[21] but in the same place in the same edn. a reading *bhavaticātra ślokaḥ* also is noted below. Apart from these quoted here, there are a few places where *bhavatyapi* is read, but such incidents are few even if all the readings noted in all the edns. are counted. Another notable thing in this respect is that all such usages are noted only as variants in the three edns. What is particularly notable is that there are only few examples of this in the G.O.S. edn. which is based on forty MSS. Also if the three edns. are considered, no single example of the use of *api* can be found where the second reading like *bhavati cātra ślokaḥ* or *atra ślokaḥ* is not noted below. This is cent percent true in the case of the G.O.S. edn., which fact carries weight. Although we did not try to trace out these usages on the basis of the different MSS yet it seems to us that most, if not all, of the particular and unusual types of usage may, if studied properly, be traceable to a particular class of MSS. Leaving such questions aside, we tend to believe in the light of our present study, which is based on the three different edns., that so far as it is used to introduce the *ānuvaṃśyas*, the use of *api* or *bhavatyapi* is not reliable except in a very few cases. These exceptions may be the places where *ānuvaṃśyas* that deal with different topics are quoted, on one occasion continuously, or where *ānuvaṃśyas* are interrupted by Bharata's own words. At present we are able to show an example of the former type. At the end of the *śṛṅgāra-rasa* topic Bharata quotes an *ānuvaṃśya* which describes the general nature of *śṛṅgāra* in support of what he says in the prose concerning the distinction between *vipralambha-sṛṅgāra* and *karuṇa-rasa*. In the printed texts the phrase *api ca* is found to introduce this particular *ānuvaṃśya* and Abhinava accepts it. But it is undoubtedly incorrect, and in fact there is also a reading *bhavati cātra slokḥ*. After this he has nothing left to say in prose about *śṛṅgāra* and still has to quote *ānuvaṃśyas* concerning *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas* of *śṛṅgāra*, so that while quoting[22] two *ānuvaṃśyas* immediately after

[19] Ibid., p. 284.
[20] Ibid., p. 224.
[21] Ibid., Vol. II, Ch. 17, p. 387.
[22] '*eva manyaḥ karuṇo'nyaś ca vipralambha iti/ eva meṣa sarvabhāvasaṃyuktaś*

the *ānuvaṃśya* referred to above, he says the following: '*api cātra sūtrārthānuviddhe ārye bhavataḥ*'. In this case *api ca* or similar wording, is absolutely necessary; it needs no argument, as it is obvious. Except for occasions like this, in all other places the usages of *api* and *bhavatyapi*, etc., seem unreliable.

As regards the use of *ca* we came to the conclusion that Bharata quite often does not use it to signify something, viz., 'also'. It is certain that such is not Bharata's method. The same is applicable to uses of *api*, in other words, with the help of *api* Bharata does not want to convey meanings like 'also'. Such a method of introduction may be a later practice or it may be some other author's practice, but it is not at all Bharata's. Therefore such usages, like *api*, *bhavatyapi*, etc., can be taken to be later interpolations and they are to be disregarded except in special circumstances, as in the cases mentioned above. Though in reality they are not to be accepted, yet one may take notice of them, as on their basis one may investigate whether those verses read under this are *ānuvaṃśyas*, even when there is no variant reading like *atrānuvaṃsyāś ślokāḥ*. Take, for example, the verses 198, 200, 201 and 202 of the *avanaddhavidhāna* Ch. (34th, K.M. edn.). These verses deserve investigation, as the phrase *api ca* is seen

śṛṅgāro bhavati/apica (Here in the first edn. there is also another reading, *bhavati cātra ślokaḥ*)

sukhaprāyeṣṭasampanna ṛtumālyādisevakaḥ
puruṣapramadāyuktaḥ śṛṅgāra iti saṃjñitaḥ
api cātra sūtrārthānuviddhe ārye bhavataḥ
ṛtumālyālaṅkāraiḥ priyajana-gāndharva-kāvyasevābhiḥ/
upavanagamanavihāraiḥ śṛṅgārarasas samudbhavati//
nayanavadanaprasādais smitamadhuravacodhṛtipramodaiś ca
madhuraiś cāṅgavikārais tasyābhinayaḥ prayoktavyaḥ'//

Ibid., Vol. I, pp. 310-11. Among these the first one explains the character of *śṛṅgāra* irrespective of *sambhoga* and *vipralambha* and the last two explain the *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas* which are seen in *śṛṅgāra*. Thus different topics are dealt with here. Abhinava comments respectively on both these usages as follows '. . . *kārikāmadhunā paṭhatyapi ceti*' and '*sūtrārthānuviddhe yāvadārye apītyapi cetyasya bhinnakramasyārthaḥ*.' These remarks are made in keeping with his interpretation of the words *sūtra* and *kārikā* and their relation as he assumes it. But we have shown how his very interpretation is refutable, so his remarks on this also are to be rejected. Moreover, Abhinava comments on *api ca* taking it to be similar to the practice among the later people, but Bharata's practice is quite different from it, so in this way also Abhinava's remark on this cannot be accepted.

immediately before. If it is the case with *api* and *bhavatyapi*, one need not take pains to prove the unreliability of usages like *paṭhatyapi*, which are noted as variants,[23] since they are similar to the observations of a commentator and obviously interpolations.

Regarding the method of Bharata's introducing *ānuvaṃśyas*, we came to the conclusion which helps in determining whether a given verse is *ānuvaṃśya* or not. So at least in an indirect way it will be of some value in the discussion of the scope of Bharata's introducing *ānuvaṃśyas*, to which topic we now turn.

SCOPE OF INTRODUCING ĀNUVAṂŚYAS

ABOUT the subject of the scope of introducing *ānuvaṃśyas* we have already expressed our views. To repeat them briefly: Bharata quotes them as an earlier authority on the subject matter in question, in order to support himself. Whenever he intends to quote *ānuvaṃśyas* he adopts the medium of prose, leaving the verse which he uses generally throughout the text. He thus avoids tediousness or monotony. In this matter we have already drawn attention to the fact that all the prose passages seen in the *N.Ś.* need not be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas*, but *ānuvaṃśyas* should be preceded by prose passages.

This implies that there are two kinds of prose passages in the *N.Ś.* The distinction intended here is not such as has been already explained by others[24] and it is based on facts or reality. If all the prose passages are looked into, one may see certain passages where subjects like *rasas*, *bhāvas*, *abhinaya*, *pāṭhya-guṇas*, *grāmas*, etc., are dealt with, and one may see some other passages where things which are to be found in the southern and northern systems of present-day music of India, respectively called *śabdas* and *bols*, are dealt with. Of course, the latter variety of prose passages are less in number in comparison to the former, and occur in the section meant for music. If further specification is needed, such passages may be

[23] Ibid., Vol. I, p.355 and K. M. edn., p. 111

[24] As shown already, S.K. De also distinguishes them as two, one variety belongs to *Sūtra-Bhāṣya* style and it is seen in the sixth and seventh Chs. and the second variety is just prose passages seen in the other Chs. But so far as it concerns the first variety this conclusion is unsupported and so far as it concerns the second variety, it is unreasonable.

seen in Chs. like *Avanaddhavidhāna*. It is well known that the *śabdas* or *bols* have their own temporal values quite different from those of metric temporal values. Everyone agrees, or is expected to agree, that in most cases the temporal values of *śabdas* or *bols* cannot be adjusted to the metrical values. In other words, generally they cannot be explained in terms of any variety of metre, even in a metre like *anuṣṭup*. It is due to this that persons who want to deal with subjects like *śabdas* or *bols* adopt prose; such is the case even with Bharata.

On the basis of the above facts the prose passages must be distinguished into two varieties. Bharata adopts the latter variety not because of the reason for which he adopts the former (that deals with the general subjects like *rasa*, *bhāva*, etc.), but because he is compelled by the subject matter dealt with in them. As already said, he adopts the former variety to break the monotony, to create interest, to express things elaborately, or to put it in short, he adopts prose as he intends to quote previous authority in verse. Therefore we need not expect that every prose passage must be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas*, that is to say we should not expect the latter variety of prose passages to be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas*.

Accordingly our conclusion that prose passages are not necessarily to be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas*, while *ānuvaṃśyas* should be preceded by prose passages is correct. Although this conclusion is based on some reasonable principle, yet it is to be further seen whether the actual data available from the three edns. of the *N.Ś.* support it or not. While investigating this matter, one should realise the fact that certain Chs. that fall within the section on music are quite irregular and full of clumsy readings in the Chow. and K.M. edns., while this portion of the text in the G.O.S. edn. has not yet come out. Therefore such Chs. surely lead to some confusion, and it is advisable to omit them. Here we propose to omit the Chs. beginning from the twenty-nineth. Such an omission, it is sure, would not lead to any handicap or disadvantage or distortion for the following two reasons: (1) No prose passage that need not legitimately be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas* occurs in any Ch. before the twenty-nineth. (2) Prose passages that should be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas* are comparatively very few in the Chs. beginning from the twenty-nineth Ch. This means we are going to leave a few passages which

should be followed by *ānuvaṃśyas*, so that these few would not invalidate the conclusion that would be arrived at. Accordingly let us examine whether or not *ānuvaṃśyas* should be preceded by prose passages.

The two tables appended at the end show eighty-seven prose passages in all. Here it should be mentioned that while counting them we did not take into account some insignificant sentences in prose, such as *yathā*, *ṛṣaya ūcuḥ*, *Bharata āha*, etc., seen here and there. There is no sense in taking them as legitimate as they are superficial and their absence does not cause any incompleteness. It is obvious now that they are interpolations. If so, it would certainly not be wrong to say that no prose passage occurs before the sixth Ch. We have also furnished notes separately under those tables whenever it was desirable to draw attention to some important matter, so we need not discuss here each and every detail regarding the nature of certain prose passages.

As we have left without counting those prose passages that fall in the Chs. beginning from the twenty-nineth, obviously it cannot be claimed that our tables will give the exact number of those passages, but that does not, as pointed out already, mean that they do not throw light on the nature of things. They do and conclusions arrived at on their basis can be depended upon. Sixty-five out of the eighty-seven prose passages are followed by *ānuvaṃśyas*, and they are arranged in table No. 1. Among the rest of the twenty-two passages *ānuvaṃśyas* are not seen. If we take them as they are found in print today, the prose passages lacking *ānuvaṃśyas* are one-third of the total number. But these twenty-two could be arranged into three classes, such as those that are doubtful, those having some traces of the *ānuvaṃśyas*, and others. Out of these three the doubtful class, which is shown as class No. II in table No. II, consists of seven passages which are not reliable at all. This means that we need not count them to be legitimate prose passages. Then the other class, i.e. having some traces of *ānuvaṃśyas*, which we have mentioned as class No. III of table No. II, consists of three. In other words, we cannot for certain take them as lacking *ānuvaṃśyas*, though there is verbally no mention of these in the printed texts to be as such. Some verses found along with them may be in fact *ānuvaṃśyas*, but somehow the phrases *atra ślokāḥ*, etc., are missing.

Then lastly we have twelve passages which are arranged in class No. I of table No. II. As we see them today, they lack *ānuvaṃśyas*. From the details given here it becomes clear that the total number of prose passages are actually (87 minus doubtful 7 =) eighty only. So the prose passages that are lacking *ānuvaṃśyas* make not even fully one-seventh of the total number. Although in these twelve cases *ānuvaṃśyas* are apparently lacking, yet on the basis of their nature it can be deduced without any hesitation that originally there were *ānuvaṃśyas* under them, and later somehow they were lost sight of by many of us (which does not necessarily mean there cannot be any possibility of ever tracing them).

This matter may be discussed here in some detail. Take, for example, the first passage (of class No. I of table No. II) which is concerned with establishing the propriety of designating certain *bhāvas* as *vyabhicārins*. We notice that apart from the passages dealing with each and every *rasa* and *bhāva*, under the passages concerning the definitions of *rasatva*, *bhāvatva* and *sthāyitva* *ānuvaṃśyas* are present. Then there is no meaning in thinking that Bharata exempts this topic from the general plan. If we come to that point there are no reasons for him to exclude it from the general plan. In fact this positively proves that *ānuvaṃśyas* ought to be there under this passage too as in every case. Similarly this is the case with our item No. 2, which deals with the definition of *sāttvikatva*. Again the same is the case also with our item No. 3, which deals with the definition of *pravṛtti*. It is true not only in these cases but also for the rest. Therefore we can hardly say that there are no *ānuvaṃśyas* under some of the passages. On the contrary we should say that under all the legitimate prose passages that are seen till the end of the twenty-eighth Ch., *ānuvaṃśyas* were there originally, although at present we may not find them under some of the passages because somehow they are missing. (We do not mean by this that under all the prose passages coming in the Chs. after the twenty-eighth need not be *ānuvaṃśyas*, they may or may not. As we have confined ourselves to the said portion in this investigation we cannot now take into account all the cases, i.e. including those that come after the twenty-eighth Ch.)

Here another fact may be mentioned. Not only do we notice in the printed edns. that some prose passages are lacking *ānuvaṃśyas*,

but also *ānuvaṃśyas* which are in want of prose passages. The best example of this catogory is *sāttvikabhāvas.* We see *sāttvikabhāvas* individually defined in verses[25] mentioned to be *ānuvaṃśyas,* but there is no single instance where there is a prose passage above those verses. In fact, as in the case of each and every *sthāyin* and *vyabhicārin,* these *bhāvas,* also according to the plan, should be defined in prose and then *ānuvaṃśyas* should be quoted. This is further supported by the prose dealing with *sāttvikatva.* It would be absurd to think of the verses defining the *sāttvikas* to be interpolations. Thus we see that not only *ānuvaṃśyas* are missing in some places, but also some prose passages are missing.

Uptill now we have concentrated on such prose passages as should be accompanied by *ānuvaṃśyas.* Now we should take up the other type of prose passages which by nature need not be followed by any *ānuvaṃśyas.* In this direction it would suffice to cite a few examples in order to establish the existence of such. They are: '*dhā dhā nācottakulaṃ dbrahulaṃ hākiriṇikirilhaṭhaṃ theṇikṛmiṇikithakhoṇaṃ iti paṇavavādyam*'[26] and '*tatra rūpaṃ nāma karaṇavibhaktaṃ yathā — ghegham ghegham ghegham kiṭimādyā trighatamatthi ghagu guru kiṭi kiṭaṃ do ghe kla iti rūpam.*'[27] In this matter we need not go into further details as these will give an idea about the nature of these passages and support our point of view. In cases like these, prose is adopted not with the same aim as in the case of those quoted in the appendix, but with a different purpose, viz. a practical purpose. Most of the materials dealt with in these prose passages have their own unchangeable temporal values and they can be adjusted to no kind of metric values; in these cases one cannot but adopt prose to deal with them. That means one is to adopt prose owing to necessity, or rather under compulsion. In cases other than these to adopt prose is entirely optional and if Bharata liked it he could have written the verses instead of the prose.

If prose of the kind quoted in the above paragraph is reliable, that is to say, if they were really written by Bharata, the prose passages found in the *N.Ś.* should be divided on the basis of their nature into two groups — one written optionally, and the second written

25 *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 6, pp. 375-7.

26 Ibid., (K.M. edn.) Ch. 34, p. 619.

27 Ibid., p. 623. The Chow. edn. differs much throughout this Ch. in readings

under compulsion. In the former case Bharata adopts prose to avoid repetition whenever he wants to quote earlier authority, viz. *ānuvaṃśyas* which contain the same matter. In the other case he uses prose because without it there is no other way and not because of his intention to quote *ānuvaṃśyas*. Thus in some cases (or in most cases) *ānuvaṃśyas* can be seen under the prose passages while in others they cannot. We can, therefore, safely conclude that wherever there are *ānuvaṃśyas*, prose passages must precede them, but it is not necessary that *ānuvaṃśyas* should follow each and every prose passage. Kāṇe is inclined to believe 'that the original kernel of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* was in mixed prose and verse.'[28] This may be true literally, but not technically, when it is viewed in the light of the above discussion.

ADDITIONS OR INTERPOLATIONS

So far as the problem of the later additions or interpolations in the *N.Ś.* is concerned, until now a satisfactory, systematic and comprehensive study has not been made. But some scholars have come forward with views or opinions about this problem. These views and their inadequacy may be briefly noted.

S. K. De thinks that the portion on music is a later addition.[29] The colophon, '*samāptaścāyaṃ (granthaḥ) nandibharatasaṅgītapustakam*', seen only at the end of the K.M. edn., and similar minor matters lead him to form this view. As it is not supported by a strong and conclusive evidence, it is difficult to accept this view. On the contrary, this portion can be taken to be genuine or original on the grounds of style, the presence of *ānuvaṃśyas*, and prose passages which should precede them, and above all its mention in the very plan of the work, i.e. *saṅgraha*. We do not argue that the absence of *ānuvaṃśyas* would prove the later origin of the text. Their presence, however, puts not a negligible weight, particularly in the *N.Ś.*, on the matter of deciding the text. The mention of different topics in *saṅgraha*, such as *svara*, *ātodya* and *gāna*, which constitute

and we have thought of giving references only to K.M. edn., as these would be enough to serve the purpose.

[28] *H.S.P.* (Kāṇe), p. 16.

[29] *H.S.P.* (De), Vol. I, pp. 32 ff.

the music portion, certainly is a positive proof of its being part of the original work. Apart from these, the system of music represented in that portion of the *N.Ś.* clearly indicates greater antiquarian tendencies. So it cannot be said that the portion dealing with music is a work of a later date and does not form the original part of the *N.Ś.*

Kāṇe, on the other hand, taking a different view in this matter, advances a tentative theory. According to him, 'The present sixth and seventh chapters, chapters 8-14 [Chow. edn.] dealing with *abhinaya* of various kinds, movements and gaits, Chs. 17 to 35 we put together at one time. The prose portions in the 6th and 7th chapters and the *āryā* verses which Abhinava says were taken from older *ācāryas* were probably composed about 200 B.C. and were taken up into the work when the other chapters were composed.'[30] From this it is clear that he considers Chs. 1-5, 15-16 and 36 to be of later origin and the prose passages and *ānuvaṃśyas* seen in the sixth and seventh Chs. are added later to the original, though the latter are quite anterior in date. Why he should think so is not explained.

It is interesting to note in the above quotation that Kāṇe thinks the sixth and seventh Chs., except the prose passages and *ānuvaṃśyas* found in them, to be among the original ones and this is repeated too.[31] At first sight one can easily find that everything mainly intended to be expounded in these two Chs. is written in prose and *ānuvaṃśyas* which contain the very matter and are quoted below those passages as an earlier authority. So if these two items—prose passages and *ānuvaṃśyas*—are left out, there remain a few verses; if the number as found in print is followed, there are (33+1=) 34 verses in the sixth Ch. and 21 verses in the seventh Ch. If it is said that these two Chs. were originally written with these few verses, that would be absurd, because without the prose passages and *ānuvaṃśyas* these verses lead to nothing. The same absurdity cannot be avoided in the case of Śāradātanaya's statement which Kāṇe accepts.[32] If this is the case with the prose passages and *ānuvaṃśyas* of the sixth and seventh Chs., what about the rest of them that are found in the other Chs.? On this issue he is silent. Like De,

[30] *H.S.P.* (Kāṇe), p. 18. [31] Ibid., p. 22, para. 2.
[32] Ibid., p. 25.

he too thinks of prose passages as written in *sūtra-bhāṣya* style with which view we disagree. Further, as has already been mentioned, he does not give specific reasons for his assumption of some portions to be later additions. It is only his assumption of the third and thirty-sixth Chs. to be later additions that we accept, not so with regard to the rest of what he says.

Here we may offer our own theory in this matter on the basis of *saṅgraha*. In the first part of this work we have presented the view of Udbhaṭa and his followers challenging the authenticity of *saṅgraha*. From the nature of their challenge itself it is evident that it is purely theoretical but not factual. Let us clarify it a bit. Udbhaṭa and his followers are afraid of *naṭa's* having *rasa* experience. It is fantastic to think that *naṭa* will have the *rasa* experience if *rasa* and *bhāvas* are mentioned in the table of contents. Lollaṭa is quite correct when he criticises the Audbhaṭas on the point of *naṭa's* having *rasa* experience. He sees no harm if the *naṭa* has this experience. Lollaṭa refutes them on their other points also. We need not attach any importance to the Audbhaṭas' doubt about *saṅgraha* on the basis of their being men of the eighth century A.D. when already many changes had taken place in the *N.Ś.* If there is any historical truth in their doubt there is no reason for Lollaṭa to miss it since he too belongs to the same period and region. Though Lollaṭa refutes the Audbhaṭas yet, as has been mentioned, he agrees that *saṅgraha* is a mere repetition. We have shown that *saṅgraha* is not a repetition, because the eleven subjects reckoned in *saṅgraha*, being requirements of *nāṭya*, are quite different from the constituents of *nāṭya* about which Bharata discusses in the first Ch. itself. Thus there is no reason to question the authenticity of *saṅgraha* and on this we can very well come to a conclusion about the later additions in the *N.Ś.*

When we can legitimately depend upon *saṅgraha*, we can safely mention all those portions of the *N.Ś.* which deal with the subjects which are not mentioned in *saṅgraha* as later additions. On this basis there are two large portions to be pointed out. According to the Chow. edn. they are: the one beginning from the *Sāmānyābhinaya* Ch. till the beginning of the Ch. on *siddhi*, and the second one beginning from the end of the Ch. on *avanaddha* till the end of the text. The two portions indicated here comprise six Chs. in the same edn., to specify them with numbers, Chs. 24-26 and 34-36. But

in the K.M. edn. these two big portions comprise eight Chs. in all, they are: 22-26 and 35-37. As the G.O.S. edn. is still incomplete only the former of these portions are specified here. This part, as in the K.M. edn., comprises five Chs., 22-26, though the number of verses vary to some extent in these two latter edns.

In this place the most interesting or important point to be noted is that all the edns. agree without fail in dealing with *siddhi* in the twenty-seventh Ch., *svaras* in the twenty-eighth Ch., *tata* in the twenty-nineth Ch., *suṣira* in the thirtieth Ch., *ghana* in the thirty-first Ch., and *dhruvās* in the thirty-second Ch. All these edns. agree by adopting the method of arrangement of the subject matter in the following way. In the K.M. edn. *prakṛti* is dealt with in the twenty-fourth Ch., but its colophon reads *sāmānyābhinayādhyāya*; and in the same edn. the twenty-sixth Ch. according to the colophon *prakṛti*, is dealt with, but actually the substance is a part of *bhūmivikalpa*. In the G.O.S. edn. *puṃstryupacāra*, according to its colophon, is described in the twenty-fourth Ch., but the actual substance is *prakṛti*; and its twenty-sixth Ch. actually deals with the part of *bhūmivikalpa* while its colophon reads *vikṛtivikalpana*. We need not enter into a discussion of the propriety of the colophons or Abhinava's views on these. It is enough to note that from the standpoint of substance there is no difference in these two edns., as is also the case with their numbering the Chs. The Chow. edn. does not leave these two items and deals with them after the thirty-third Ch. as fully as these other two edns. do. In spite of this difference in dealing with the various items in places far apart, they agree, as mentioned, in dealing with *siddhi* and the above mentioned other items from the twenty-seventh Ch. The same edition, i.e. the Chow. edn. splits *aṅgābhinaya* (which is expounded only in the nineth Ch. of the K.M. and G.O.S. edns.) into two subjects — *hastābhinaya* and *aṅgābhinaya* — and expounds them in the nineth and tenth Chs. Similarly, it divides the subject matter of the seventeenth Ch. of the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. into two items — *bhāṣāvidhāna* and *kākuśvara* — and deals with them in its eighteenth and nineteenth Chs. respectively. In this way before the twenty-seventh Ch. two Chs. are increased in the Chow. edn. which compensate in numbering the twenty-fourth and twenty-sixth Chs. of the K.M. and G.O.S. edns., and thus *siddhi* stands as the subject matter to be dealt with

in the twenty-seventh Ch. in all the three edns. Till the end of the thirty-second Ch. the subject matter runs parallel in all the three edns.

Dhruvāgāna[33] is the subject in the thirty-second Ch. in all the edns., but the difference is that *gāyakaguṇa-doṣas* are dealt with at the end of the above subject in the Chow. edn. whereas in the K.M. edn. it is dealt with in a separate Ch., viz. the thirty-third. Thus from this place the difference comes in in numbering the Chs. In the thirty-fourth Ch. the Chow. edn. deals with *prakṛti* while it is the subject matter of the twenty-fourth Ch. in the K.M. edn. Again both the edns. — K.M. and Chow. — agree in dealing with the subject of *bhūmivibhāga* in the thirty-fifth Ch. with the difference that the subject matter of the twenty-sixth Ch. of the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. is included in the thirty-fifth Ch. of the Chow. edn. In the thirty-sixth and thirty-seventh Chs. of the K.M. edn. *naṭaśāpa* and *nāṭyāvatāra* are respectively dealt with while in the Chow. edn. both are discussed only in one Ch., i.e. the thirty-sixth, in the name of *nāṭyāvatāra*.

If the text available in print is accepted as it is, it will have to be noticed that the propriety of the division of Chs. would be as follows. There does not seem a necessity or a principle when the Chow. edn. divides *aṅgābhinaya* as *hastābhinaya* and *aṅgābhinaya*, and devotes two Chs., the nineth and tenth, for this, but there might be a propriety when it separates *kākusvaravidhāna* from *bhāṣāvidhāna* and devotes two Chs., the eighteenth and nineteenth. It may not again be improper to deal with *gāyaka-guṇa-doṣas* along with *dhruvāgāna* in one Ch., i.e. in the thirty-second, unlike the K.M. edn. which treats them separately devoting the thirty-second and thirty-third Chs. It is quite proper when it deals in one Ch., i.e. in the thirty-fifth with the subject matter discussed in the K.M. edn.. devoting two Chs., viz. the twenty-sixth and thirty-fifth, because it is one and the same subject. Similarly, the Chow. edn. is more reasonable when it treats *naṭaśāpa* and *nāṭyāvatāra* in one Ch., i.e. in the thirty-sixth,

[33] As the part beginning from the twenty-eighth Ch. to the end of the text has still to appear in the G.O.S. edn., we are to base this discussion on the rest of the two edns. only. From the account given by M.R. Kavi (Introduction to Vol. II, of the *N.Ś.*, pp. xiii-xv) it seems the G.O.S. edn. coincides with that of the K.M. from the twenty-eighth Ch. onwards also.

whereas the K.M. edn. unnecessarily devotes two Chs. merely causing an increase in the number of Chs.

One edn. may contain a few verses more in one Ch. than another and vice versa. But from the point of view of number of subjects there does not exist any difference in these three edns. Even from the point of view of the itemwise arrangement of the subjects there is no difference except in two cases, viz. *prakṛti* (24th Ch.) and *vikṛti* (26th Ch.), as the latter is called in the G.O.S. edn., but which, in fact, is a part of *bhūmivibhāga*. But whatever notable divergence we could see in different edns. lies in the itemwise division of the subject matter. We also notice the difference in the numbering of the Chs. when we look into them from the point of view of the substance in terms of items.

The above discussion clarifies the position of the material and its arrangement in the three different edns. as they are available in print. The inadequate mention of the position of MS. material does not permit us to discuss the present problem on the basis of different MSS. But it is possible to discuss the question on the basis of the printed edns. as a whole.

Let us now see the subject matter treated in the big portions which have been mentioned by us to be later additions. The former portion, according to the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. comprises five Chs. (22-26) and the subjects dealt with in these are: (i) *sāmānyābhinaya*, (*ii*) *vaiśika* or *bāhyopacāra*, (*iii*) *prakṛti*, (*iv*) *citrābhinaya* and (*v*) *vikṛti* (or in fact a section of *bhūmividhāna*) respectively. According to the Chow. edn. the former portion comprises three Chs. (24-26) dealing respectively with (*i*) *sāmānyābhinaya* (*ii*) *vaiśikopacāra* and (*iii*) *citrābhinaya*. The latter portion which begins after the completion of the whole subject on music comprises, according to the K.M. edn., three Chs. (35-37) which deal with (*i*) *bhūmivikalpa*, (*ii*) *naṭaśāpa* and (*iii*) *nāṭyāvatāra* respectively. In accordance with the Chow. edn. also this comprises three Chs. (34-36) in which (*i*) *prakṛti*, (*ii*) *bhūmivikalpana* and (*iii*) (other two subjects, *naṭaśāpa* and *nāṭyāvatāra*, in one name) *nāṭyāvatāra* are respectively treated. But none among all these subjects is mentioned in *saṅgraha* wherein eleven requirements of *nāṭya* — *rasa*, *bhāva*, *abhinaya*, *dharmī*, *vṛtti*, *pravṛtti*, *siddhi*, *svara*, *ātodya*, *gāna* and *raṅga* — are reckoned. Therefore it is a clear evidence of the fact that these two large portions were added

to the *N.Ś.* later, i.e. these do not make up the original portions of the *N.Ś.*

This conclusion is further supported by a later attempt to increase the number of subjects in *saṅgraha* to thirteen by adding two items to the original eleven names. This is as follows: '*upacāras tathā viprā maṇḍapāś ceti sarvaśaḥ/trayodaśavidho hyeṣa hyādiṣṭo nāṭyasaṅgrahaḥ.*'[34] From the opposition raised by the Audbhaṭas against *saṅgraha* consisting of eleven subjects we cannot determine the date of this attempt to increase the subjects in *saṅgraha*. The MSS. followed by them might not have contained this and the other corresponding verses read in *kārikā* as well.[35] Of course this interpolated verse, too, does not cover all the subjects which we have noted to be later additions. But it can definitely serve as an indication to the fact that later on some of the matters (which we have called later additions) are added to the original *N.Ś.* There is no doubt about it that the above quoted verse and the one quoted in footnote 35, Part III, are interpolations as indicated by the closing remark or the word, *saṅgraha*, that is read at the end of the verse devoted to the furnishing of *saṅgraha* (i.e. table of contents).

The fact that these subjects are later additions is proved by the very nature of most of them. Some subjects — say *prakṛti* and *bhūmivikalpa* — are, it is true, really connected with the technique of drama. That Bharata and his predecessors have a definite idea about *prakṛti* is well proved by the several statements of Bharata in the *rasa* and *bhāva* treatment, by *pravṛtti*, and even by *vṛtti*. Although in those places no definition is given, yet one can trace a definite concept of *prakṛti* from those places. But such a thing does not coincide with what is treated in a chapter (K.M. edn. 24 and Chow.

[34] *N.Ś.*, (first edn.), Vol. I, Ch. 6, *Śl.* 11, p. 266.

[35] In the above verse we notice *maṇḍapa*, i.e. *raṅga*, is repeated. But in *kārikā*, also, the corresponding verse to this is interpolated and it runs thus: '*uttamādhamamadhyā ca prakṛtis trividhā matā / bāhyābhyantarasambhūta mupacāradvayaṃ bhavet*' (first edn. *Śl.* 32, p. 272). In this, *prakṛti* is classified instead of *maṇḍapa*. So, on this basis we may infer that *prakṛti* is originally read in the former verse instead of *maṇḍapa*. If this is correct, then the order of hemistichs of the latter verse also should accordingly be altered. Or the reading, *raṅgasya* (*śca*) *prakṛti reva ca*, which we have noted (in footnote 18 of Part II) in the place of *raṅgaśca saṅgrahaḥ* of the *śloka* dealing with *saṅgraha* may also be taken into account here.

edn. 34) named after *prakṛti*. In this chapter a division of *prakṛti*. as *uttama*, *madhyama* and *adhama* is found. But by this nothing of *prakṛti* can be explained. The rest of the stuff dealt with in this Ch. has in reality nothing to do with *prakṛti*; all this is really about something else. From any of the other places we cannot make out that Bharata has any intention to treat such unscientific stuff. That in the scrupulously scientific treatment of Bharata such a thing could creep in is unbelievable. Thus this Ch. (twenty-fourth in the K.M. and G.O.S. edns., or thirty-fourth in the Chow. edn.) turns out to be a later addition.

In reality, the twenty-sixth Ch. of the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. has no independent existence, for it belongs properly to the topic of *bhūmivikalpa* itself. So it should share the fate of the thirty-fifth Ch. which is devoted to *bhūmivikalpa*. Apart from the lack of any mention of it in *saṅgraha*, no trace is found elsewhere in the *N.Ś.* that Bharata had an intention of treating it by devoting a chapter to it. Nor is it closely connected with any of the subjects counted in *saṅgraha*. The fact that this subject belongs to the dramatic technique is not a strong argument for assuming that this subject is expounded by Bharata himself. It is not necessary that everything connected with drama should be felt in every age to be an unavoidable requirement. Bharata might not have felt it to be very necessary to treat it in detail, if at all he has said something about it, he might have made some general remarks somewhere. We find a passing remark in the very first Ch. *yathābhūmivibhāgaśaḥ*.[36] It is probable that later people might have noted such remarks and felt it necessary to treat this at length adding this to the original *N.Ś.* But, as it is, the treatment of this subject also is not quite scientific, which again suggests that it is not Bharata's writing.

If we come to the rest of the subjects — *sāmānyābhinaya*, *vaiśika* and *citrābhinaya* — these are not connected with any of the subjects reckoned with in *saṅgraha*. Take, for example, *sāmānyābhinaya* (Ch. 22nd in the K.M. and G.O.S. edns., 24th in the Chow. edn.), if at all *vākya*, *sūcā*, *aṅkura*, *śākhā*, *nāṭyāyita* and *nivṛtyaṅkura* can stand as independent *abhinaya*, a Ch. may be devoted to *sāmānyābhinaya*. In fact, there is no meaning in conceiving it to be an

[36] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. 1, p. 21.

independent *abhinaya*. Moreover, even if such a status is conceded, out of more than three hundred verses seen in this Ch. there are only nine or ten that deal with it. The rest of the verses are devoted to several miscellaneous subjects, which can in no circumstances be called *abhinaya*. Therefore so-called references, for instance, *tāśca sāmānyābhinaye vakṣyāmaḥ*, found elsewhere[37] cannot be taken to be reliable. Thus there is no sense in calling it the *sāmānyābhinaya* Ch. At any rate, no such thing can be ascribed to Bharata.

The *Vaiśika* Ch. (23rd in the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. and 25th in the Chow. edn.) also has no connection with any one of the subjects mentioned in *saṅgraha*. Later people might have seen statements, of course, if they are at all reliable, i.e. original, for instance, '*vaiśikaśāstrakārais ca daśāvastho'bhihitaḥ*'[38] and on the basis of which they might have added a full Ch. to this topic. In any case such a detailed treatment of this subject does not fit in with the general plan of the *N.Ś.*, and it is meaningless to think of it as Bharata's work. The *Citrābhinaya* Ch. (25th in the K.M. and G.O S. edns. and 26th in the Chow. edn.) has also no connection with any subject mentioned in *saṅgraha*. It seems to be a subject that might have developed after *nṛtya* had grown into a full-fledged art. This matter has been to some extent discussed by us elsewhere.[39] This also does not fit in with the original plan of the *N.Ś.*

Now *naṭaśāpa* and *nāṭyāvatāra* (Chs. 36th and 37th in the K.M. edn. and 36th in the Chow. edn.) are left. It is absurd to accept these subjects, as found, at the end of the text or there is no meaning in accepting them to belong to the original plan, because whatever should be said of *nāṭya* in general, has already been stated in the episode of the birth of *nāṭya* in the very beginning of the text. It is hardly believable that these matters were written by the same person who wrote the birth eposode. Certain statements, for example, '*śeṣa muttaratantreṇra kolhalaḥ kathayiṣyati*'[40] definitely prove that these portions were added by later people to show the sanction of Bharata to whatever they wanted to say.

From the reasons variously stated above and also from the common reason, viz. the lack of the mention of any of the subjects

[37] Ibid., Ch. 6, p. 309. [38] Ibid.

[39] *N: T.M.R.*, pp. 42-3.

[40] *N.Ś.* (Chow.), Ch. 36, *Śl.* 65, p. 474; (K.M.) Ch. 37, *Śl.* 18, p. 665.

dealt with in these Chs. in *saṅgraha*, these two sizable portions of the *N.Ś.* — 22-26 and 35-37 Chs. in the K.M. edn. and 24-26 and 34-36. Chs. in the Chow. edn. — appear to be later additions. In these Chs. the style of writing definitely deviates from the rest of the *N.Ś.* The language, too, no longer retains any older tendencies that are often found in the other parts of the text.

In the above discussion the absence of a given subject in *saṅgraha* has been taken to be the main criterion in deciding certain portions to be later additions. If so, the question may arise whether the same would be applicable to the other items, for instance, *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, *doṣa* and so on, which also are not mentioned in *saṅgraha* by name. Although subjects like these are not specifically mentioned in *saṅgraha*, yet they are closely connected with *abhinaya* (or, to be more specific, *vācikābhinaya*), which is the third of those listed in *saṅgraha* according to the order of importance. *Vācikābhinaya* is dependent on the literary composition, so all that the literary composition requires is closely connected with *vācikābhinaya*. For this reason all such material is expounded in connection with *vācikābhinaya* and this is quite reasonable. In fact, each and every item need not be individually mentioned in *saṅgraha*, since all such items would be covered by a major item, such as *abhinaya* and others. For this very reason they need not also be mentioned in *kārikā* too. *Kārikā* is meant for a major division of the subjects mentioned in *saṅgraha*. So these individual items cannot, or may not, find a place in *kārikā* too. But major names next to the names of the subjects mentioned in *saṅgraha* will be found in it. In accordance with this principle *vācikābhinaya* is mentioned in *kārikā*. Thus there is no scope for these comparatively minor items to be entered either into *saṅgraha* or into *kārikā*. But they could be treated individually in the Chs. devoted to *abhinaya* or *vācikābhinaya*, because they go along with it. Except this there could not be any other reason for their not being mentioned in either *saṅgraha* or in *kārikā*, and for being treated in the topic of *vācikābhinaya*. If this is not accepted one should also reject *daśarūpavidhāna* and *sandhyaṅgas* (Chs. 18th and 19th in the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. and Ch. 20th and 21st in the Chow. edn.) to be part of the original plan. If this is done, there does not exist any *N.Ś.*, because without these subjects no *nāṭya* could exist. Therefore, we cannot exclude these subjects from the original

plan of the *N.Ś.* This clearly shows that the subjects closely connected with those mentioned in *saṅgraha* fall within the original plan of the *N.Ś.* The same would be the case with the separate items of *aṅgābhinaya*, too. In the way shown here the items *sāmānyābhinaya*, *vaiśika*, etc. which have been pointed out by us to be later additions, have no real relation with any of the subjects mentioned in *saṅgraha* and divided in *kārikā*. The word *abhinaya* seen in *sāmānyābhinaya* and *citrābhinaya* is not conclusive, because there must be a definite relation with those four well-known *abhinayas*. And if we come to that point, as we have shown already, the so-called *sāmānyābhinaya* is not treated in the entire Ch. that goes under its name, but in a few verses only. So this is a decisive proof that it does not belong to the original plan. *Citrābhinaya*, too, does not deserve separate treatment in a work like the *N.Ś.*, meant for expounding the basic things of the art and whose method of treating the subjects is scrupulously scientific. This is not to deny the fact that subjects like *sāmānya* and *citra abhinayas* as such could not have had any scope to come into existence and be treated elsewhere in a period when people were engaged in elaborating the subjects. In fact our argument is that they were expounded later and then incorporated in the *N.Ś.* in order to get the sanctity. But in the nature of things such subjects cannot have any justification for being present in the original *N.Ś.* Thus subjects like *sāmānya* and *citra abhinayas*, *vaiśika* etc., on the one hand, and subjects like *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa*, *doṣa*, etc., on the other can in no circumstances be equated simply because both classes are absent in *saṅgraha*. They should be distinguished.

Whether all the Chs. which we have till now pointed out to be later additions belong to the same period, is quite a difficult question to answer. But something may be mentioned by way of suggestion. We have noted that one portion precedes the *siddhi* and music section of the text which falls within the original, while the other portion succeeds it. There must have been some reasons for this. We may infer that these two parts belong to different dates. We are inclined to suggest this on the basis of the Chow. edn. because it shows better tendencies in arrangement of the subject dealt with in these two portions. On this basis we like to mention that the former portion dealing with *sāmānyābhinaya*, *vaiśika* and *citrābhinaya* is of an earlier date than the latter which is concerned with *prakṛti*,

bhūmivikalpa and *nāṭyāvatāra*. This appears plausible when certain matters found in the Ch. on *prakṛti* are noticed, for instance, some kind of repetition of the material of the *Sāmānyābhinaya* Ch. and of the *Vaiśika* Ch. in particular. There will not be any wonder if *nāṭyāvatāra* was the item which was added at a still later date in comparison to the rest of the items of this second portion.

In this place it may be further pointed out that the people who added the former portion might have thought it better to insert this meterial not at the end of the text, i.e., at the end of the music section, but after the *āhāryābhinaya* Ch. for the reason that the items they want to insert bear the name *abhinaya*. While the other people who have added the latter portion might have not found any such favourable place as their predecessors and added it at the end of the text or at the end of the section on music. Here in these two paragraphs whatever is suggested is only a probability, it needs further investigation to be established.

If the latter additions are made out mainly on the basis of *saṅgraha* and they are left out, the remaining text would be according to the Chow. edn. 1-23, 27-33 Chs. This would bring the total number of the chapters to thirty. According to the K.M. and G.O.S. edns. 1-21, 27-34 Chs. making the total number thirty-one.[41] It is not that in this bulk there are no later additions. There certainly are and it is on these that we are to concentrate now.

In the foregoing pages while discussing the actual beginning of the technique of drama, we have stated that the first five Chs. are meant for the general introduction to *nāṭya* but not to the text of the *N.Ś.* These remarks are based on the text as available in print. But among these five Chs. the third one seems to be a later interpolation. The subject of this Ch., as explained, is *gṛhapaveśavidhi* or *raṅgadaivatapūjanam*, as the colophon calls it. How in a technical work such as the *N.Ś.* rituals find a place is doubtful. There might be a simple

[41] M.R. Kavi in the Preface to Vol. II of the *N.Ś.* says that according to his *Bha* MS. 'the whole work extends over only 32 chapters' (p. IX). At the beginning and the end of every Ch. he has not fully noted how this particular MS. divides Chs. and numbers them. So it is difficult to venture anything on its basis. But it is evident from Kavi's notes (Vol. III, p. 147 and p. 233) that it contains *Sāmānyābhinaya* and *Vaiśika* Chs. Regarding *prakṛti* and *Bhūmivikalpa* Chs. how it reads is not known to us. In any case, from the above this much becomes clear that this MS. will not be of use to us.

reference to them but so much elaboration is not needed. Here too there is a notable change in the language which is not caused by the change of subject matter. Here various parts or places of *raṅga* are described as protected by different gods. This is a repetition, because this matter has already been explained in the first Ch.[42] Here in the third Ch. one finds additional names not only of gods but others too, for instance *Garuḍa*. Even some minor gods or, strictly speaking, seers—Sanatkumāra, Dakṣa, etc. appear. Scholars of religious history would be able to point out the date of its composition. But all these indicate that this Ch. cannot belong to the original text of the *N.Ś.*

Next to this a portion of the fourth Ch. should also be mentioned as a later addition. This comprises more than fifty verses from the 267th to 320th,[43] i.e. till the end of the Ch. except the last verse. This is not a subject to be dealt with in this place. Apart from this, it seems to be the one which was composed after the art of *nṛtya* had developed. (This matter has been discussed by us elsewhere.[44])

Attention should also be drawn to two of the portions at the end of the fifth and sixth Chs. At the end of the fifth Ch. the portion comprising unnumbered verses, as indicated by Śāstri (and also by Kavi in the first edn.) appears to be superfluous.[45] In the sixth Ch. the portion comprising unnumbered verses which deal with *śāntarasa*[46] has no place in the original of the *N.Ś.*, because Bharata never mentions it, particularly in *kārikā*. In this matter modern scholars are unanimous[47] and further discussion is not needed. As K.S. Rāmaśwāmi Śāstri points out,[48] a small portion at the end of the seventh Ch. comprising nine verses (181-189) may be counted

[42] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, *Śls.* 83-98, pp. 31-3.

[43] Ibid., G.O.S. edn., pp. 179-205; K.M. edn., pp. 62-7; Chow. edn. pp. 47-51.

[44] *N: T.M.R.*, pp. 36-7.

[45] *N.Ś.*, G.O.S. edn., Vol. I, pp. 251-9; K.M. edn., pp. 85-9; Chow. edn., pp. 65-8.

[46] Ibid., G.O.S. edn., Vol. I, pp. 332-5; K.M. edn., pp. 103-4; Chow. edn., does not contain it.

[47] Especially *see* Preface to the second edn. (G.O.S.) of the *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, pp. 4-6. K.S. Rāmaśwāmi Śāstri discusses about it at length and it is difficult to agree with him in all points. Also *see* V. Rāghavan's *N.R.*, p. 15 et seq.

[48] *See* Preface to the Vol. I, of the second edn. of the *N.Ś.*, p. 6.

among the later additions. Apart from the two big portions pointed out earlier, these also are later additions in the *N.Ś.*

By this we do not mean that later additions cannot exist elsewhere in the remaining text. In fact, there are some other portions that are extremely suspect, for example, the portion dealing with *gāyaka-vādaka-guṇa*[49]*-doṣas*. Here one finds a description of the defects as well as of the virtues of *gāyaka*, *vādaka*, *vāṃśika*, *vaiṇika*, *etc*. But these are topics to be dealt with in their respective Chs., as there are different Chs. specially devoted to these items. According to *saṅgraha* the Ch. on *dhruvās* (i.e. the 32nd in all the edns.) should be placed after the *Avanaddha* Ch., i.e. as the thirty-third instead of as the thirty-second. (This matter will be seen later in some detail.) If that is the original order of the Chs., taking all the matters expounded in previous Chs. that are devoted to music as a whole, there is a possibility for making certain remarks generally at the end of the *Dhruvā* Ch. as it would be the last Ch. to deal with the music. Even if such be the case it is difficult to believe that these remarks should have been made at such length and in such a manner.

Similarly, when we look into the Chs. on *chandovidhāna*, *vṛttavidhāna*, *bhāṣāvidhāna* and *vṛtti*[50] a doubt may arise as to whether the present form and bulk is the part of original text. In this way there may be some other big and small questionable passages in the remaining text. For the present we do not feel confident to conclude anything on these problems. It is better to reserve them for the future. It is certain that these parts, too, need a close and careful study.

Thus for the present we come to the conclusion that the following portions belong to the original text of the *N.Ś*:

(*i*) Chs. 1–2,
(*ii*) Ch. 4 except the verses 267–329 (G.O.S. edn.),
(*iii*) ,, 5 ,, unnumbered verses ,,
(*iv*) ,, 6 ,, ,, ,, ,,
(*v*) ,, 7 ,, ,, ,, ,,

[49] K.M. edn., whole of the 33rd Ch.; Chow. edn., 32nd Ch. verses 458–84, pp. 426–8.

[50] In the Chow. edn. 15, 16, 18, and 22nd Chs. while in the G.O.S. and K.M. edns. 14, 15, (first part of the) 17th and 20th Chs. respectively.

(*vi*) Chs. 8-21 (G.O.S. and K.M. edns.) or 8-23 (Chow. edn.),
(*vii*) ,, 27-34 (,, ,, ,, ,,) ,, 27-33 (,, ,,).

For the sake of ready reference let us present those of the later additions to the original text of the *N.Ś*:

(*i*) Ch. 3 (in all the edns.),
(*ii*) Some verses 267-329 in the 4th Ch. (G.O.S. edn.),
(*iii*) Unnumbered verses ,, ,, 5th ,, ,,
(*iv*) ,, ,, ,, ,, 6th ,, ,,
(*v*) ,, ,, ,, ,, 7th ,, ,,
(*vi*) Chs. 22-26 (G.O.S. and K.M. edns.) or 24-26 (Chow edn.),
(*vii*) ,, 35-37 ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, 34-36 ,, ,, .

Many of the modern scholars agree that no additions were made in the *N.Ś*. after the fourth or at most the fifth century A.D. Therefore these later additions, too, belong to a fairly early period and are valuable, especially in the present day when no work on the subject of such an early date is available. Except for the subjects *naṭaśāpa* and *nāṭyāvatāra* they are valuable in tracing the development of dramatic theory and practice. That they may be later additions does not take away all value from the material. Even the items *naṭaśāpa* and *nāṭyāvatāra* may be useful in tracing the position of the dramatic art and artists in the then contemparary society. Here in a mythological garb an attempt has been made to give an explanation of the given conditions. Thus all this material may prove to be useful in some way or another. But as integral parts of the original *N.Ś*. these cannot have any value, for they cannot come within the plan of the work. From this textual standpoint we have, it is true, described them as interpolations, but that is not to deny all values to them.

The whole of the text, which we could uptill now decide to be the original, consists of two parts—the one meant for general introduction to the *nāṭya* and the second meant to expound the technique of the dramatic art. The arrangement of the material in the latter part of these deserves our attention. The mention of the subjects in *saṅgraha* is highly significant and logical. To repeat the order, *rasa*, *bhāva*, *abhinaya*, *dharmī*, *vṛtti*, *pravṛtti*, *siddhi*, *svara*, *ātodya*, *gāna* and, lastly, *raṅga*. The main principle followed in arranging the items in a given order seems to be *importance* and secondly

relation. *Rasa* being the sole aim of this art deserves the first place. *Bhāva* related to it is reckoned in the second place. Or both of them may be taken to be highly important, but between the two the former is more so. Accordingly both are mentioned as the first and second. The next in importance is *abhinaya* because it is a means to attain the former two and also from the point of view of drama, which it distinguishes from others, or characterises. Thus it is mentioned as the third. *Dharmī*, though it is a mode of representation (*anukṛti*), is closely connected with *abhinaya*, the act of communication. That is why it is mentioned in the fourth place, i.e. beside *abhinaya*, but not because it is more important than *vṛtti*. *Vṛtti*, which by nature is the mode of behaviour of dramatis personae, occupies the next important place, not as such but as a principle of division of plays, that is to say from the point of view of the dramatic technique. It is mentioned in the fifth place. In the sixth place *pravṛtti* is noted because it is closely connected, at least from the point of view of its explanation, with *vṛtti*. *Siddhi* obviously is more important than music, so it is placed as seventh. The next important item is *svara*, i.e. music as a whole, so it is mentioned in the eighth place and *ātodya* in the nineth place as it is a branch of general music. The *gāna* dependent on the former two is mentioned as tenth. *Raṅga*, which from the comparative point of view is less important than the above ten, is mentioned as the eleventh. Thus the list reveals that it is an intentional plan or a deliberate deed.

All the items of *saṅgraha* are mentioned in that very order in the *kārikā* as well, which displays the same material after splitting them. One can, therefore, expect that all these items would be treated according to *kārikā* order in *nirukta*, i.e. the part of the text which is meant for expounding the technique or the requirements of *nāṭya*. But one finds in the printed editions that only the majority of the items are treated in the order of *kārikā* but not all of them. Take, for example, *sāttvikābhinaya* which is the last among the four *abhinays* to be mentioned in *kārikā*, but it is the first to be dealt with. Similarly *daivī* and *mānuṣī siddhis* are found altered in the order of treatment. Somehow or other we may seek an explanation for this change of order of the *kārikā*. According to the present edns. we find that the order of *saṅgraha* is not followed. This is only in f ive cases, *dharmī*, *pravṛtti*, *vṛtti*, *gāna* and *raṅga*. *Dharmī*,

which should be dealt with after the four *abhinayas*, is seen treated in *aṅgābhinaya* itself. It is the same with *pravṛtti* which should be treated after *abhinayas* and *vṛtti*. *Vṛtti* itself is to be treated after the four *abhinayas* but is found in between *vācika* and *āhārya*. Gāna should not be treated before *avanaddha*. *Raṅga*, which should be explained at the end, is expounded in the second Ch. even before the technical portion is started, i.e. in the introductory part itself. But it is unbelievable that the order of *saṅgraha* can be thus set aside. As we have seen the subjects are arranged in *saṅgraha* very consciously and Bharata attaches great importance to it. Taking serious note of this change of order Abhinava gives from time to time some sort of explanation for it. We need not go into its detail because we are going to take a different line and it will not be useful for us. But it is enough to give a reference to a typical example of his explanation, his introductory remarks on *pravṛtti*.[51]

We may assume that Bharata deals with different subjects according to the order of *saṅgraha* but this has been changed by the people when they made some additions. To suggest something for the restoration of the original order in the present circumstances is quite a difficult job, but not altogether impossible. We now venture in that direction.

The Ch. on *dhruvās*, along with the *guṇa-doṣas* of *gāyaka* and *vādaka*, etc., should come after one Ch., i.e. the Ch. on *avanaddha*. The Ch. on *raṅga*, which is now found as the second, should be arranged at the end of the text, i.e. after the Ch. on *dhruvās*. The *Vṛtti* Ch. also should be placed one Ch. after, i.e. after the Ch. on *āhāryābhinaya*. By these changes the text could be for the most part regularised and this does not involve changes in readings except for a few minor ones. Above all, no link will be disturbed by this because all these Chs. are quite independent units. Thus there is no reason for getting upset. The difficulty comes only in the case of *pravṛtti* and *dharmī*, which are seen to be treated in one Ch.,—the thirteenth in the G.O.S. and K.M. edns., or the fourteenth in the Chow. edn.—along with *kakṣyā* in the portion devoted to *aṅgābhinaya*. These three subjects are, in fact, not interdependent but simply put together. There may be some kind of relation among them, as Abhinava explained,[52] but it is not such a relation that demands their treat-

[51] *A.B.*, Vol. II, p. 205. [52] Ibid.

ment side by side. The only thing necessary is that the treatment of *kakṣyā* should precede that of *pravṛtti*, no matter if several Chs. intervene. This proves that the thirteenth (or in Chow. fourteenth) Ch. could be divided into three parts dealing with *kakṣyā*, *pravṛtti* and *dharmī*. Of these the first could easily be attached to the Ch. on *gati* (i.e. twelfth in the G.O.S. and K.M. edns. and thirteenth in the Chow. edn.). Now the problem would be whether the rest of the two subjects should be, like the first, attached to some Chs., or reckoned as independent Chs. On the basis of the fact that for each subject of *saṅgraha* a Ch. is, or some Chs. are, devoted by Bharata throughout, we prefer to suggest that those parts dealing with *dharmī* and *pravṛtti* should be counted as two Chs. And these two Chs. should be placed before and after the Ch. on *vṛtti* respectively. If so, *dharmī* should come between the two Chs. on *āhārya* and *vṛtti*, the latter of which we have mentioned above to follow the former. Then the *Pravṛtti* Ch. comes between *vṛtti* and *siddhi*.

According to this suggestion different Chs. dealing with the separate subjects (of *saṅgraha*) along with the general introduction to *nāṭya* take the following order:

(*i*) Chs. 1-3 meant for the introduction to *nāṭya*,
Ch. 1, episode of the birth of *nāṭya*,
,, 2, *nṛtta*,
,, 3, *pūrvaraṅga*,
(*ii*) Ch. 4 *rasa*,
(*iii*) ,, 5 *bhāva*,
(*iv*) Chs. 6-17 *abhinaya* (except *sāttvika* which is found in the Ch. on *bhāva*),
Chs. 6-10, *āṅgika*,
,, 11-16, *vācika*,
Ch. 17 *āhārya*,
(*v*) Ch. 18 *dharmī*,
(*vi*) ,, 19 *vṛtti*,
(*vii*) ,, 20 *pravṛtti*,
(*viii*) ,, 21 *siddhi*,
(*ix*) ,, 22 *svara*,
(*x*) Chs. 23-26 *ātodya*,

Ch. 23, *tata*,
,, 24, *suṣira*,
,, 25, *ghana*,
,, 26, *avanaddha*,
(*xi*) Ch. 27 *gāna* and
(*xii*) ,, 28 *raṅga*.

We have heard some scholars expressing a strong doubt as to whether the *N.Ś.* is at all a deliberate work, that is to say no part of it has been written on a given plan. They are inclined to suggest that it had taken its present form through the additions made at different times by the actors who had given shape to their experience as it went on increasing. The whole ground for such an assumption is the one simple fact that there are some later additions to it. We, too, have admitted that there are indeed some later additions, but that should not mean that there is no plan at all. It may be hoped that people will not foster such a view any more.

We shall touch upon one more point before we close this topic. In deciding about the original of the *N.Ś.* we have based our arguments mainly on *saṅgraha*. This is a fact. If so, there is a possibility of questioning the genuineness of the Ch. on *nṛtta* as well as *pūrvaraṅga* on the same basis, because these two subjects are not mentioned in *saṅgraha*. We have already explained this to some extent. *Pūrvaraṅga* falls outside the technique of *nāṭya*. Owing to certain conditions prevailing at the time of the first performance of dramatic art, this has been created and later on with some changes this has become a custom followed throughout the succeeding centuries. That is why it is treated in connection with the birth episode. In order to make *pūrvaraṅga* vivid and interesting *nṛtta* is added to it some time after the creation of *nāṭya*. On this basis we can assume that it refers to an occurrence of the meeting for the first time of the two independent arts, *nāṭya* and *nṛtta*. This happened, we can take it for granted, in Bharata's own time. For two reasons its treatment in the *N.Ś.* seems genuine or original. One is that this is a historical fact, and the other is that it is specifically referred to in the birth episode and treated accordingly. But such a reference to the subjects of the Chs. which we have pointed out to be later additions is not found anywhere. *Nṛtta* cannot find a place in *saṅgraha* for this came into

contact with *nāṭya* in Bharata's time. So it cannot be added in *saṅgraha* which, as explained, is concerned with the subjects that are dealt with in earlier *Sūtra* and *Bhāṣya*. After all, *nṛtta* is not a constituent of *nāṭya*. Hence it is quite logical to treat it before the *nāṭya* technique is started. Therefore, *nṛtta* and other subjects that are added to the N.Ś. later on, cannot be taken to be of a similar nature.

In whatever manner the present age may criticise the ancient Indians for attaching the supreme authority to one source or to one person, we cannot say that it is without reason in all cases. Whatever may be the truth in other cases, in Bharata's case one can plead that it is quite appropriate. This is because of the comprehensive, more particularly the scientific nature of his treatment of the subject. How far this fact is realised in the present age is doubtful. The *N.Ś.* occupies a unique place in Indian literature. For this there are several reasons. It remains true even after we have eliminated several Chs. and passages from the text as available in print, deciding them to be later additions. The reason is this: so far as those eliminated Chs. go, from the point of view of dramatic technique the material found in them is not of much value except some matters of *bhūmivikalpa*. Therefore the elimination of such Chs. will cause no serious loss and all the essential and scientific material remains intact in the rest which we have decided to be original, because of which material the *N.Ś.* occupies so high a place in Indian literature. Before one offers any criticism on our conclusions regarding the restoration of the original of the *N.Ś.* this simple fact should be remembered.

RECENSION

If we come to the question of the different recensions in the *N.Ś.* M.R. Kavi raises this for the first time in the Preface to Vol. I of the G.O.S. edn. So far as the works of recent scholarship in this direction till now go, he is the only person to handle or study quite a large number of MSS. collected from various parts of India. He is thus singularly fit to give a comprehensive account of this matter. In the Preface to Vol. II he promises to give such an account in a separate volume, but it has never been fulfilled. It is

unfortunate that the results of the study of a scholar who has spent nearly half a century in this line of learning could not see the light. Whatever may have been his difficulties, it is true that he does not follow a definite or consistent method while editing the *N.Ś.* So it is not possible to draw any conclusion on the question of recension on the basis of Kavi's edn.

K.S. Rāmaśwāmi Śāstri who re-edited the first volume in the same series, does not favour[53] the theory of two recensions of Kavi (confining himself to the first seven Chs). Śāstri's argument that 'there is no likelihood of such recensions in the case of the works of Śāstraic importance' is not convincing on the face of the existing material found in the printed texts and also Kavi's attempt at drawing attention in the Preface to Vol. Ist and IInd [54] to certain 'chief tests that differenciate the two recensions'. In the same place Śāstri contradicts himself by admitting the fact that it is possible 'that some commentators of the *N.Ś.* might have effected some changes in the text to suit their own methods of interpretation and some scribes might have mixed up portions of other later writers with the text of the *N.Ś*'. 'These seem', he further observes, 'to be some of the possible reasons for the differences existing in the manuscripts of the *N.Ś.* today'. We have already noticed that there is a conscious attempt in numbering different Chs. which cannot be in the nature of things attributed to scribes. There could not be a better reason for the recensions than what Śāstri infers, that changes might have been caused by some commentators to suit their own interpretations. Śāstri is also in disagreement with Kavi about accepting the recension on the regional basis on the ground that some portions supposed to belong to a given recension are found in the MSS. found in both parts of India—North and South. That these facts have not escaped Kavi's observation is evident from his Preface to the first Vol. Śāstri is concerned only with the seven Chs. Also he does not seem, though he claims, to

[53] *See* Preface (pp. 10-12) to the second revised edn. of the *N.Ś.* Vol. I.

[54] *See* Preface to the Vol. I, p. 8 and Vol. II, p. viii ff. While discussing the problem of later additions in the *N.Ś.*, we have taken into account the textual differences referred to by Kavi, but we did not depend on the theory of recension because our knowledge of it is not sufficient to conclude anything on its basis.

utilise new MSS. which have not been used by Kavi. In these circumstances it is difficult to rely on Śāstri. This does not necessarily mean that we support the theory of recension as suggested by Kavi.

The theory of recension as indicated by Kavi may or may not be true, that is a different matter. But as a possibility it cannot be denied that there may be two or even more recensions. Similarly it may not also be denied that such recension came into being originally in particular regions. The truth and merits of the theory of recension could be decided only by those who handle critically a sufficient number of MSS. collected from all over India.

In fact, it is an immense problem in itself, more so when the causes leading to such recensions are to be indicated. What we wish to say here is that this our present attempt to distinguish the original text of the *N.Ś.* from its later additions changes the position of the theory of recension suggested uptil now because it is mostly based on the material which we have pointed out to be later additions. It is true that when we speak of recension, literally it includes all the later additions — whether big or small. But in the case of the *N.Ś.* we like to make a difference between original and later additions even while speaking of recension, because some parts of the present *N.Ś.*, which we have pointed out to be later additions, are big enough and found together, i.e. not scattered in small quantities. The different recensions may exist also in the portion treated as original. Thus the problem of recension takes a two-fold form or is divided into two types — one belonging to the original and the other relating to the later additions.

To make a sharp distinction between the nature of these two types of recension is difficult. This is so because there is a further necessity of making a critical study of the portion mentioned to be original. What we could do uptill now is to decide the original framework or the boundaries of the original. We have already pointed out that within this framework there are questionable portions. To put it precisely, we have expressed a doubt as to whether portions like *bhāṣāvidhāna*, *vṛtti*, etc. were originally in the present form, agreeing that as subject matter they belong to the original plan. Nevertheless, the nature of these types of recension may be pointed out only in a broad sense. The nature of recension

that might prevail in the original portion is interpretative while the nature of the recension concerned with the later additions is obviously appendant. The study of recension should be made separately on the basis of the two different parts — original and later additions — of the *N.Ś.* and thus this problem grows more complex.

DATE

In connection with the date of the *N.Ś.*, for the present there is nothing new to offer, except to mention one fact. There is a general agreement among the scholars nowadays that the second century A.D. is the probable date of the *N.Ś.* while some portions were added in subsequent centuries. As mentioned earlier, the problem of the original text of the *N.Ś.* has not yet been thoroughly investigated, nor what portions of the present *N.Ś.* comprise the original. This is what we have attempted here, there is the further necessity of deciding the nature of some portions that fall within the framework which we consider to be original. The problem of its date can be taken up only after these issues have been suitably settled.

AUTHOR

In spite of an age-long general acceptance of Bharata's authorship of the *N.Ś.*, now and then a controversy has been raised in different ways. The use of the word 'Bharata' in the *N.Ś.* as an individual responsible for its writing, and also as an actor, leads to several speculations. This has been so not only in our own times but also in ancient days. There are other reasons as well which have led to speculation, all of which we cannot discuss now. The following are among the cases already brought to light and discussed by some scholars.

According to Abhinava[55] some people hold that in the *N.Ś.* the portions containing questions are written by the pupils of Bharata while the rest of the work is by Bharata. Abhinava dismisses this view saying that the acceptance of plurality of authorship would lead to absurdity and that there are examples in different literatures where a single person assumes two roles — questioner

[55] *N.Ś.*, Vol. I, Ch. I, pp. 8-9.

and expounder. Abhinava goes on to say that by this refutation those *nāstikadhuryopādhyāyas* are doomed who hold that the present *N.Ś.* is a compilation of the essence of three authors — Sadāśiva, Brahma and Bharata — the compilation in which the theory of Brahma figures as most important. According to this view it is not clear who is responsible for this compilation, certainly not Bharata, because there is a verbal denial, *natu muniviracitam.* In refutation of the latter view Abhinava advances two more 'indispensable' evidences — scriptural (*śabda*) and universal acceptance (*lokaprasiddhi*) — to prove that it is a work of Bharata. Abhinava condemns the latter view in clear terms, yet some modern scholars — Kavi, and following him Rāghavan and Kṛṣṇamācāri — erroneously attribute[56] the same to him. But Abhinava firmly expresses his view that Bharata alone is responsible for the whole of the present *N.Ś.*[57]

In this matter there are other accounts found in fairly later authors like Śāradātanaya and others. M. R. Kavi was the first to draw attention to this material.[58] According to Śāradātanaya[59] there is an original *Nāṭyaveda*, two epitomes of which were made at the instance of Manu by *bharatas* comprising 12,000 and 6,000 *ślokas* respectively. According to this account certain people get the name *bharatas* because they 'bear' the *Nāṭyaveda*[60], and this *Veda* is also called after their name, *bharata*. This *Nāṭyaveda* is a work of Ś*iva*. Here Kavi seems to make a mistake when he assumes *dvādaśasāhasrī* to be a work of *Sadāśiva*. It cannot be a work of

[56] *See* M.R. Kavi's Preface to Vol. I of the *N.Ś.*, pp. 1-2. Kavi is mistaken not only in attributing this view to Abhinava, but also when he mentions that according to this view Bharata is the author of this work. K.S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri also incorrectly presents this view (*see* his Preface to *B.P.*, p. 32). P.V. Kāṇe properly presents this matter by correcting Kavi, but leaves two other scholars — V. Rāghavan and Kṛṣṇmācāri — who took the same queue instead of correcting the mistake of Kavi. *See N.R.*, p. 5 and 10; *H.C.S.L.*, p. 811 respectively.

[57] For example, see *A.B.*, Vol. I, Ch. 1, p. 6, l. 13 and ll. 19-20; and p. 8, ll 22-23, etc.

[58] His Preface to the Vol. I, of the *N.Ś.*, pp. 1-2.

[59] *B.P.*, p. 287. Also *see* pp. 284-7 for a full and different story about the birth of *nāṭya*.

[60] Kāṇe falls into an error explaining '*kaścinmuniḥ*' as Bharata, *see. H.S.*P (Kāṇe), p. 27.

his because it is an epitome made by so-called *bharatas*. In this account there is no mention as to how many thousand *ślokas* comprise the so-called *Nāṭyaveda*. But Kavi, on the basis of *Yāmalāṣṭakatantra*, constructs that it consists of 36,000 *ślokas*. Strangely enough the quotation given by him from the said *tantra* does not actually refer to the *Nāṭyaveda* of Śāradātanaya's account or the other, but *Gāndharvaveda*, which, from the standpoint of contents, is somewhat similar to *Saṅgītaratnākara* and similar works. Another important point to be noted in this account is that there is no specific mention that the *N.Ś.* is identical with the *ṣaṭsāhasrī* of this account, it may be implicit but is not obvious. Citing the observations of Abhinava, Dhanika and Bahurūpamiśra, Kavi says that our present work is *ṣaṭsāhasrī*. Here we are to observe that what Dhanika, particularly Abhinava, means is only this much that the present work comprises six thousand *ślokas*. But there is no evidence to state that they accept the existence of a *dvādaśasāhasrī* and *Nāṭyaveda* other than the present *N.Ś.* or the similar account as given by Śāradātanaya. Further, Kavi claims to 'have fragments of both *Brahmabharata* and *Sadāśivabharata*', but it is not clear what work is meant here by the former of these two titles. Kavi's theory as shown here is repeated by some[61] and fairly similar material is collected and discussed by Kāṇe.[62]

As has been pointed out, the first view of the dual authorship of the *N.Ś.*, which is refuted by Abhinava, is based on the portions containing questions. It is an imaginary division and cannot be taken as based on serious evidence. What was the reason that caused the second view (criticised by Abhinava) is not clear, and that, too, cannot be taken to be authentic, since no material is known to support it.

If we come to Śāradātanaya's account it is too early to speculate on the reasons for it. It would not be surprising if one day it turns out that this and similar accounts are really speculative and the basis for such speculation is nothing but Bharata's use of prose and

[61] For example, Rāghavan (*N.R.*, p. 5 and 10) Kṛṣṇamācāri (*H.C.S.L.*, p. 811) and K.S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri (*see* his Preface to Vol. I, second edn. of *N.Ś.* pp. 16–17).

[62] *H.S.P.* (Kāṇe), pp. 22–28. But all that he says in this place cannot be accepted

the usages like *saṅgraha*, *ānuvaṃśya* and so on. But for the present it is plain that this account is fully coloured with the religious sectarian bias. Similar accounts might have been the product of sectarian rivalry that was started more or less in the early medieval age. In them there is Brahma, there is Śiva, there is Bharata, that is an invariable feature, and Viṣṇu and Taṇḍu also may sometimes find a place in them. But the position of importance of all these gods changes frequently in accordance with a given account. This leads one to think that in the ultimate sense the birth episode of *nāṭya* found in the *N.Ś.* seems to be the sole source of such accounts, but sectarian motives alter the position and importance of the different gods referred to. It is, therefore, hardly believable that there can be any historical significance in them.

Kavi says that there are now some fragments of different *bharatas* or *sāhasrīs*. Kāṇe indicates similar things.[63] So we should not deny the very existence of such works, they may exist. But there is no reason to accept them to be earlier than the *N.Ś.* These are the quite later authors who mention Ādibharata, Bharatavṛddha, etc., leading us to the impression that such works are earlier than Bharata. What is it that is dealt with in the supposed original *Nāṭyaveda* and *Dvādaśasāhasrī*? Is it the same as is found in the present *N.Ś.* designated to be *ṣaṭsāhasrī*, or has it much more material? If it is the same, then for what is such a bulk meant when the whole matter could be completely explained in *ṣaṭsāhasrī*? If it is said that they contain more material, that would be unbelievable.

Although we do not have early medieval works, yet we know from some quotations given in still later works that the tendency of the writers after our present *N.Ś.* is towards elaboration, and not towards abridgment. Kavi himself shows this.[64] We do not mean by elaboration the bulk, but the expansion of the subject matter. Some of this elaboration is real and scientific while in other cases it is mere splitting up or superficial. We are not concerned here with the values of this tendency, but what it is as such. This means that after Bharata there has been a considerable development of the subjects dealt with in the *N.Ś.*, especially of *nṛtta*, *gāndharva*,

[63] Ibid., p. 25.

[64] *See* his Preface to Vol. II, p. vi ff.

etc., and also of *nṛtya*[65] which is due to Bharata. Further there is another kind of elaboration caused by interpretation. Again in the writing of the text-books we see a tendency towards abridgement from the tenth century onwards. Strictly speaking, from the point of view of substance this text-book writing is not guided by the tendency towards abridgment. Each and every subject grew so enormous that it became an unwieldy and almost impossible job to write on all the subjects in one place. Consequently specialisation becomes inevitable and one man expounds only about play-writing, while another deals with music and some one else takes up *nṛtya* and so on. Whether such specialised works are big or small, from the point of substance they are not abridgements because they contain the material in all its details as developed in later times. When we keep this historical development in view, it would be fantastic to say that the present *N.Ś.* is but an epitome of an enormous *Nāṭyaveda*. In fact from the chronology we have traced of works of dramatic art of the pre-Bharata period the present *N.Ś.* would appear to be an elaboration and not an abridgement. While such is the case, it is unfortunate that scholars should spread sentimental theories on the basis of motivated writings of sectarian rivalry. At least the style and substance should reveal to the scholars that *Vṛddhabharatas*, *Sadāśivabharatas* or different *sāhasrīs* are quite later than our present *N.Ś.* In similar cases, for example, *Abhinayadarpaṇa*, some scholars have advanced the theory that such works are surely very ancient in substance, though not in their present literary forms. This is, without doubt, another example of sentimental theorising. Thus these later accounts cannot be relied upon.

The original *N.Ś.*, i.e. the present *N.Ś.*, without later additions, is not written by several authors. This we have proved by tracing a definite plan in it. So far as the present *N.Ś.* goes, there are not many Bharatas to write it. The general acceptance and also the mention of Bharata in the *N.Ś.* as its author and the use of the same, i.e. the word *bharata* in the *N.Ś.* itself in the sense of actor, have puzzled many. None seems to take into consideration the fact that there is no usage of the word *bharata* in the sense of actor in the

[65] *See N*: *T.M.R*, p. 30 ff.

literature earlier than our *N.Ś.*[66] By the fifth century A.D. this word becomes popular also in the sense of actor, as such it even finds a place in an authentic lexicon.[67] There must be some reason for this, viz. calling actors by a general name *bharatas*. In the circumstances it is quite reasonable to infer that there might have been a great *ācārya* of dramaturgy after whom everyone taking to playacting as profession is named. It is also to be noted that this word *bharata* does not connote only the person who follows his theory, but it generally connotes everybody who takes to acting as a profession. Therefore it would be quite logical to come to a conclusion on the basis of universal acceptance that the *ācārya* who exerts such an influence on the people is none else than Bharata, the author of our *N.Ś.* (excluding later additions). In this place the important thing is that the word *bharata* in the sense of actor occurs only in the later part of the *N.Ś.* as available in print. All these portions are, as we have pointed out, later additions. Of course one sees it in the Ch. on *vṛtti* which comes under the original plan of the *N.Ś.* We have expressed the doubt whether the present form of this Ch. is genuine. It is plain that the fashion of calling actors as *bharata* comes later than the age in which the original of the *N.Ś.* was written. This accords with the lexicon, *Amarakośa*, which fact strengthens the conclusion that actors were called *bharatas* only *after* Bharata had written the *N.Ś.*

[66] Kāṇe draws attention to the use of the word *bharata* in the *Yājñavalkya-smṛti* in the sense of actor (see *H.S.*P. (Kāṇe), p. 27). But it cannot be taken to be earlier than the *N.Ś.* as concluded by himself (see his *H.D.S.*, Vol. I).

[67] '*śailālinastu śailūṣā jāyājīvā kṛśāśvinaḥ / bharatā ityapi naṭāś cāraṇāstu kuśīlavāḥ*' A.K., *kāṇḍa* II, *nāṭyavarga*, *Śl.* 12. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri (*see.* his Preface to Vol. I of the second edn. of the *N.Ś.*, p. 15) is mistaken when he draws the conclusion on its basis that 'there existed three kinds of *naṭas* as the (1) *śailāli* or *śailūṣa* (2) *kṛśāśvi* or *jāyājīva* and (3) *bharata* or *naṭa*'. If this verse is to be interpreted in this way, then *śailāli* and *kṛśāśvi* cannot be called *naṭas*. He has overlooked the usage *ityapi* which definitely indicates that all these six words are synonyms. In Pāṇini *śailālins* and *kṛśāśvins* are said to follow different schools of systems, but there is no evidence in support of Śāstri's view that, like the above, the system expounded by Bharata is considered to be a third independent school. Whatever may be the case with the latter, it is definite from the treatment of Amarasiṃha that in the later ages, or to specify it roughly, in the Christian era, schoolwise distinction of actors as *śailālins*, *kṛśāśvins* and *bharatas* is not made.

From the above discussion it has become quite clear that it is a myth to say that our present *N.Ś.* is an epitome of some larger work like *Ādibharata*, *Vṛddhabharata*, *Sadāśivabharata*, etc., or that the *N.Ś.* is written by several authors. It has also become plain that before the *N.Ś.* the actor was never called *bharata*. This practice comes into vogue after the original *N.Ś.* had been written and the writer of this work is Bharata. In spite of this, Bharata is not the first person to write on dramatic art as the chronology of the works of the pre-Bharata period proves. According to this, Bharata is fourth in the order of writers on the subject.

In the birth episode as recorded in the first Ch. of the *N.Ś.* there is a clear mention that Bharata is the first performer of *nāṭya* immediately after it was created by Brahma. In view of this the question now arises how a single person can be both the first performer and the fourth one in the order of the writers. This is indeed a knotty problem.

There are scholars who see this problem though not exactly in the same perspective in which we have viewed it. 'Who is Bharata?'[68] R. V. Jāgīrdār questions. In an attempt at an answer he dismisses that a person named Bharata could write the *N.Ś.*, saying: 'That a mythical sage should write the *Nāṭya-śāstra* does not appeal to a reasonable mind; that actor or actors should write it does not answer the common sense point of view.' He takes all the usages of the word *bharata* found in the *N.Ś.* as available in print, and after some discussion comes to the conclusion: 'Thus the word *bharata* in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* refers in the first instance to some members and descendants of a [Vedic] clan or family of that name. This family was the first sponsor and manager of Dramatic Representation. . . After some time *bharata* meant anyone and everyone who sponsored the art and managed or took part in the production.' It is clear that he is mainly interested in the semantics of the word *bharata*. This he finds to be the name of a Vedic clan or tribe which was the first to sponsor *nāṭya*, or dramatic representation. Even if this is accepted, that cannot determine that the first sponsors are the writers of the work, viz. our *N.Ś.* But he never answers this question. This is because he has dismissed the possibility that a person named Bharata, or *bharatas*, i.e. actors, should have

[68] *D.S.L.*, Ch. IV, pp. 27-31.

written the *N.Ś*. There is no evidence to trace back *nāṭya* to so early an age as the Vedic period. Apart from such possibilities or impossibilities, his grounds are defective. It is true in the first Ch. of the *N.Ś*. there is a mention of Bharata and his sons, but — and this is important — there is no mention that his sons are also called *bharatas*. Such a mention is found at the extreme end of the *N.Ś*. which portion is, as we have shown, a later addition in a period when already the followers of Bharata or actors in general have come to be called *bharatas*. Jāgīrdār's assumption that the first sponsors of *nāṭya* are people of a Vedic tribe is not tenable. From the available material it is not possible to bring a *Bharata* clan into the picture. If actors are called *bharatas* that is only after Bharata, as we have concluded. This fact does not alter the truth that an *ācārya*, viz. Bharata is responsible for writing the 'original' *N.Ś*.

There are other scholars, for example, Manomohan Ghosh,[69] who think that there never existed any real person as Bharata, that is to say Bharata is a mythical figure. In this connection Ghosh advances the silence of *Purāṇas* and epics as a proof. The scholars of this school believe that originally the word *bharata* meant an actor which gives 'rise to an eponymous author', i.e. Bharata. Consequently, they say, the *N.Ś*. is attributed to Bharata. The base on which these scholars draw such a conclusion is slender if not untrue. It is obvious that they have failed to note that the case is really vice versa, i.e. it is not that a mythical figure is created because of the actors who are called *bharatas*, but that it is due to their adherence to the instructions of an *ācārya* named Bharata that certain men i.e. *nāṭas* have been called *bharatas* in the age after that *ācārya*. In fact Bharata is not at all a mythical figure and the question that *Purāṇas* and such literature should refer to him does not arise. Even if he is a mythical figure the silence of *Purāṇas* cannot be taken as conclusive. In some cases, for example, Bhāsa, if scholars raise the question of attribution, that is entirely on different grounds. In the case of the *N.Ś*. there is an unbroken or age-long general acceptance of Bharata's authorship and, secondly, there is none else to claim its authorship. Thus in every way the theory of 'attribution' of the authorship of the *N.Ś*. to Bharata seems fanciful

[69] *See* Introduction to his E.T. of *N.Ś*., p. LXXI.

and uncalled for. Bharata is a real figure and the undisputed author of the *N.Ś.*

The problem of how a single person can be both the first performer of *nāṭya* and the fourth one in the order of writers on *nāṭya* remains to be solved. We may better understand the truth if in the beginning itself we try to realise the importance of Bharata's rôle as an *ācārya* first and next as a writer on *nāṭya*. As we have shown elsewhere,[70] it is in his age that *nṛtta* and *nāṭya* come into contact and influence each other. As a consequence of it *nṛtya* comes into being for the first time. *Nāṭya*, too, gains a definite place in the society and emerges as a powerful art form. It is clear from the *N.Ś.* that Bharata is the person to perceive and seize the opportune moment to make an adjustment and give shape to all these in a perfectly coherent manner. Above all, he is able to record all the synthesis he has made in a beautiful and simple language i.e. in the *N.Ś.* This may be a reason for the disappearance of the earlier texts from the picture. We know of none who comes after Bharata talk anything of the earlier works or their substance except a mere mention of names of *ācāryas* like *Śilāli* and *Kṛśāśva*. If this is true, it means that the *N.Ś.* has been able to serve better than any of those earlier works in recording all the new developments occurring till that time. Thus in the manifold advance of *nāṭya* the contribution made by Bharata is unique. Although it is not the very beginning of *nāṭya*, yet this phase is not less significant than the birth itself.

It is fit and proper that he should figure as a unique *ācārya* in the later tradition as well as in the *N.Ś.* itself. The first Ch. of the *N.Ś.* records historical facts in a mythological guise. If we can forget for a while this guise and see into the things described in it, we find all of them to be natural occurrences. Causes that lead to the creation of *nāṭya* are social conditions. There is one to create it deliberately after a great deal of thought. There is another person to take the responsibility of performing the newly created *nāṭya*. There are also some elements that hasten and attend to the ruin of this art. There is an attempt to save it from the adverse conditions. In time there is another person who suggests to bring into contact other element, *nṛtta* with *naṭya*. Let those people who cannot note

[70] N: *T.M.R.*, p. 30ff.

the realities of the situation talk that 'the story of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* is but a badly made legend worthy of no credence.'[71] Not one among these incidents is an unnatural or impossible occurrence. Brahma, Bharata, Viśvakarman and Śiva are symbolically mentioned here as responsible for the different items. If these names are taken, as they are, none among them is responsible for any of the items. To take such a view is a sign of inability, a failure to see the facts apart from the colour that characterises an early age, an elementary error.

As in the case of the real human being responsible for the creation of *nāṭya*, there is also no way to know the real human being responsible for the first performance of it. As the first creation of it is attributed to Brahma, the first performance is put to the credit of Bharata. In view of Bharata's contribution to *nāṭya*, this attribution is not illogical, though the real first performer must have preceded Bharata by several centuries. This attribution is, however, not made by others but by Bharata himself. Here in this point there comes an attribution, but this question does not arise in the case of the authorship of the *N.Ś.*, as proved by several facts and particularly by the fact that actors are called *bharatas* only after the 'original' *N.Ś.* Therefore, Bharata is a real human being who advanced the practice as well as theory of *nāṭya* and thus he is the person to write the *N.Ś.*

Except that he is the author of the *N.Ś.* we do not know any further details of Bharata. K.S. Rāmaswāmi Śāstri misleads us when he says[72] that Bharata belongs to Kāśmīra. It is true that in the early and middle mediaeval ages many of the schools of aesthetics are founded there and most of the leading commentators on the *N.Ś.* and others come from that part of India. But that does not prove that Bharata also should belong to that area. Bharata's beautiful description of Himālayas, as Śāstri believes, cannot make him Kāśmīrian. It is better not to talk of such details until conclusive evidences come into light.

[71] M.M. Ghosh, 'The Problems of the Nāṭyaśāstra' *I.H.Q*, Vol. VI, 1930, p. 72.

[72] *See* Preface to Vol. I of the second edn. of the *N.Ś.*, pp. 16-17.

CONCLUSION

To conclude: this new interpretation not only puts the correct meanings of the seven technical terms used by Bharata in their proper order but also throws some light on several allied problems such as the chronology of works on *nāṭya*, works which are anterior to the *N.Ś.*, the method and scope of introducting *ānuvaṃśya* verses, the later additions or interpolations into the original text of the *N.Ś.*, recension, date and authorship of the *N.Ś.* The chronology as traced here would, if accepted, alter the modern assumptions about the beginnings of *nāṭya*.[73] Also, so far as the account of the *N.Ś.* goes, *nāṭya* is not, as supposed by some, an outcome of something else but comes into existence because of a deliberate attempt.

[73] For the modern views about the origin and beginnings of *nāṭya* see *H.S.D.*, p. 1, ff.

APPENDIX

Table No. I

Table of the references to the prose passages found along with *ānuvaṃśya* verses in Chs. 1-28 of the *N.Ś.*

I Note number	II Serial number	III The beginning and end of the prose passages	IV G.O.S. edn. p. or pp.	V K.M. edn. p. or pp.	VI Chow. edn. p. or pp.
			Vol. I Ch. 6	Ch. 6	Ch. 6
	1	*tatra rasāneva .. abhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*	272–89	93	71
	2	*atrāha kiṃ rasebhyo .. abhinirvṛtti riti*	292	93–4	71
	3	*eva mete .. bībhatsa iti* ..	294–5	94	72
	4	*eva meteṣāṃ .. śṛgṇāro bhavati* ..	299–310	95–6	73
	5	*atha hāsyo nāma .. tadā parasthaḥ*	312–13	97	74
	6	*atha karuṇo nāma .. svarabhedādayaḥ*	317	99	75
	7	*atha raudro nāma .. raso'numantavyaḥ*	319–22	99–100	76
	8	*atha vīro nāma .. romañcādayaḥ*	324	100	77
	9	*atha bhayānako nāma .. maraṇādayaḥ*	326	101	77
	10	*atha bībhasto nāma .. vyādhimaraṇādayaḥ*	328	102	78
1	11	*atha adbhuto nāma .. pralayādayaḥ*	329–30	102	78
	12	*bhāvānidānīṃ .. vyāptyartham*	ch.7 342–5	ch.7 104–5	ch.7 79
	13	*atha vībhāva iti .. anarthāntaram*	346	105	80
	14	*athānubhāva iti .. abhinaya iti*	347	105	80
	15	*evaṃ te .. nivṛtyartham* ..	348	106	80
	16	*tatrāṣṭau bhāvāḥ .. niṣpadyante*	348	106	80
	17	*atrāha—yadi .. rasanāma labhate*	349	106–7	80–1
	18	*lakṣaṇam .. ratināma .. anubhāvaiḥ*	350	107–8	81
	19	*hāso nāma .. anubhāvaiḥ* ..	350	108	81
	20	*śoko nāma .. samudbhavaṃ ceti*	351	108	81–2
2	21	*krodho nāma .. prayoktavyaḥ* ..	352	109	82
	22	*utsāho nāma .. prayoktavyaḥ* ..	353	110	83
	23	*bhayaṃ nāma .. prayoktavyaḥ*	353–4	110	83
	24	*jugupsā nāma .. prayoktavyaḥ*	354	111	84
	25	*vismayo nāma .. prayoktavyaḥ*	355	112	84
	26	*tatra nirvedo nāma .. abhinayet*	356	113	84
3	27	*glāni .. prayoktavyaḥ* ..	357	113	85
	28	*śaṅkā .. prayoktavyaḥ* ..	357–8	114	85
	29	*asūyā nāma .. prayoktavyaḥ* ..	358	114–15	86
	30	*mado .. pañcavidhabhāvaś ca*	359	115	86
	31	*śramo .. prayoktavyaḥ* ..	360	116	87
	32	*ālasyaṃ .. anubhāvaiḥ* ..	361	116	87

	33	dainyaṃ .. prayoktavyaḥ	..	361	117	87
	34	cintā .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	361	117	87
	35	moho .. prayoktavyaḥ ..	..	362	117	88
	36	smṛtirnāma .. anubhāvaiḥ	..	362	118	88
	37	dhṛtirnāma .. anubhāvaiḥ	..	363	118	88
	38	vrīḍā .. abhinayet ..	..	363	119	88–9
	39	capalatā .. prayoktavyaḥ	..	364	119	89
	40	harṣo .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	364	120	89
	41	āvego .. sampradhāraṇādibhiḥ	..	365	120–1	89–90
	42	jaḍatā .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	366	121	90
	43	garvo .. prayoktavyaḥ ..	..	366	122	90
	44	viṣādo .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	367	122	91
	45	autsukyaṃ .. prayoktavyaḥ	..	367	123	91
	46	nidrā .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	367	123	91
	47	apasmāro .. prayoktavyaḥ	..	368	123	91
	48	suptaṃ .. abhinayet ..	..	368–9	124	92
	49	vibodho .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	369	124	92
	50	amarṣo .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	369	125	92
	51	avahitthaṃ .. prayoktavyaḥ	..	370	125	92
	52	ugratā .. abhinayet ..	..	370	125	93
	53	matiḥ .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	371	126	93
	54	vyādhir .. abhineyaḥ ..	..	371	126	93
	55	unmādo .. abhinayet ..	..	372	127	93
	56	maraṇaṃ .. abhinayet ..	..	372	127	94
	57	trāso .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	373	128	94–5
	58	vitarko .. anubhāvaiḥ ..	..	374	129	95
				Vol. II		
				Ch. 8	Ch. 8	Ch. 8
	59	yaduktaṃ .. avadhāryam	..	1–2	135	98
				Vol. II		
				Ch. 17	Ch. 17	Ch. 19
4	60	trīṇi .. śira iti ..	..	387	280	221
5	61	ucco nāma .. nipīḍanādiṣu	..	392–4	281–2	222
	62	evaṃ virāmo .. arthānudarśakaḥ	..	400	284	224
				..	Ch. 28	Ch. 28
	63	tatra yo yatra .. saṃvāda iti	..	..	432	317–18
6	64	atha dvau grāmau .. pratyavagantavyaḥ ..	..	..	433–4	318–19
7	65	sādhāraṇavidhi .. prayogaḥ	..	..	436–7	321

TABLE NO. II

Table of the references to the prose passages found without *ānuvaṃśya* verses in Chs. 1–28 of the *N.Ś.*

Class No. I.

I Note number	II Serial number	III The beginning and end of the prose passages	IV G.O.S. edn. p. or pp.	V K.M. edn. p. or pp.	VI Chow. edn. p. or pp.
			Vol. I Ch. 7	Ch. 7	Ch. 7
	1	*eva mete .. vyabhicāriṇaḥ .. vartayiṣyāmaḥ*	355–6	112	84
1	2	*atrāha .. kimanye .. abhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ*	374–5	129–30	95
			Vol. II Ch. 13	Ch. 13	Ch. 14
	3	*atrāh .. pravṛttiriti .. abhinayāśca* ..	205–7	216	165
			Vol. II Ch. 17	Ch. 17	Ch. 19
2	4	*pāṭhyaguṇān .. upapādyāḥ* ..	385–6	280	221
3	5	*tatra hāsya .. kampitai riti* ..	390–1	281	222
4	6	*atra aṅgāni ṣat .. druta iti* ..	396–9	283–4	224
	7	*atra ca .. boddhavyāni*	402	285	225
				Ch. 28	Ch. 28
	8	*vivādinastu .. catuḥprakāramiti* ..	..	432–3	318
	9	*tatra mūrchanātānā .. kākuvidhāne* ..	..	436	320–1
	10	*etāsām .. nirvartayanti*	..	438–9	322
	11	*atha nyāsaḥ .. saṅkhyaḥ* ..	..	443	327
5	12	*aṃśagrahān .. vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* ..	..	444	325

Table No. II

Class No. II—Doubtful

I	II	III	IV	V	VI
			Vol. I Ch. V	Ch. V	Ch. V
	1	*nāndīpadānām .. micchanti* ..	219 (1st edn.)	70	..
			Vol. II Ch. 14	Ch. 14	Ch. 15
	2	*atra svarāḥ .. vyañjanavargāḥ* ..	227	221–2	170
2	3	*akuhavisarjanīyāḥ .. ityapare* ..	228	..	..
				Ch. 24	Ch. 35
3	4	*tatra sūtradhāraguṇān .. vāditratattvavedanañca*		400	466

			Ch. 28	Ch. 28	Ch. 28
4	5	*ātodya .. vakṣyāmaḥ*	..	429	316
4	6	*etāsāṃ .. nirvartayanti*	..	43[illegible]-9	322
4	7	*ṣatsvaraṃ .. prakārairiti* ..	..	444	..

Table No. II

Class No. III—Having Some Traces of Ānuvamsya Verses

I	II	III	IV	V	VI
			Vol. II		
			Ch. 17	Ch. 17	Ch. 19
1	1	*dvividhā kākuḥ .. tārānta miti* ..	391-2	281	222
				Ch. 28	Ch. 28
2	2	*atha mūrchanāḥ .. srutinidarśane proktam*	..	434-5	319-20
3	3	*dvividha .. sañcāraḥ*	..	443	3[illegible]7

NOTES UNDER THE TABLES OF THE REFERENCES TO THE PROSE PASSAGES

Table 1

Prose Passages Found Along With the Ānuvamsya Verses

1. After this passage dealing with the *adbhuta-rasa*, *śānta-rasa* is found in the text where a prose passage appears as usual. But it is not counted here, for it is clearly known to be an interpolation.

2. The K. M. edn. reads the *āryās* here but without mentioning *atra āryāḥ*, etc., while the other two edns. read them with specific mention as *atra āryā bhavanti*.

3. As above.

4. In the Chow. edn. the numbering is incorrect. The same edn. reads *bhavatyapi* giving the impression that the following verses are *ānuvaṃśyas*. The K.M. edn. also reads the same, but in addition to this two different readings *bhavati* and *apica* are noted below. The G.O.S. edn. reads *bhavatyapi* and, in addition to this, two readings *bhavantyapi* and *bhavati cātra ślokaḥ* are also noted. It is better to accept the last of these readings as it is more clear.

5. While commenting on one of the *pāṭhyālaṃkāras*, viz. *druta* described in prose, Abhinava observes that *mandrāpi kākuś cātra bhavatīti saṅgrahaśloke vakṣyate* (Vol. II, p. 395). By this it is clear that he calls the *ānuvaṃśyas* also as *saṅgrahaślokas*. The *śloka* he specifically refers to here is '*lalle ca manmane* . . . *mandrā drutā ca* . . .'.

6. In this prose passage, after two sentences have been completed there is a verse, oft-quoted even in the later ages. In the absence of the word *ānuvaṃśya* it cannot be decidedly said now whether it is really *ānuvaṃśya* verse or not. It may or may not be *ānuvaṃśya*, this prose does not end with it. As the topic does not properly end here, we should count the prose running before and after this verse as one passage and not two.

7. The Chow. edn. does not read *atra ślokau*. At the beginning of this topic, viz., *sādhāraṇavidhi*, after a few prose sentences, there is a verse, viz. *chāyāsu bhavati*, etc. (K.M. edn. p. 436). It is to be seen whether this verse is *ānuvaṃśya* or not.

Table II

Prose Passages Found Without Ānuvamsya Verses

Class No. 1.

1. A verse, viz., *trayastriṃśa dime bhāvā vijñeyā vyabhicāriṇah/ sāttvikāṃstu punar bhāvān pravakṣyāmyanupūrvaśah*, precedes the present prose passage, the verse which, in its turn is preceded by another prose passage, *eva mete trayastriṃsad vyabhicāriṇo* bbhāvāḥ, etc. Only the G.O.S. first edn. (p. 379) reads *atra ślokaḥ* while others are silent. The G.O.S. and K.M. edns. read this prose alike whereas the Chow. edn. reads it differently. The reading *atra ślokaḥ* seen in the G.O.S. first edn. does not seem reliable, nor is there any necessity for such a thing here. Generally Bharata closes a topic and then takes up a one new in one and the same prose passage whenever there is a necessity, for instance, see how he closes the *sthāyins* and takes up the *sañcārins* (Vol. I, p. 355) and also (Vol. I, pp. 348–9) how he closes the definition of the *bhāvatva* and begins the topic of the *sthāyitva*. In view of these it is obvious that not only is there no necessity of a sentence *atra ślokah*, but also of any verse like, *trayastriṃsa deme bhāvāh*, etc. But of course this topic of *sañcārins* does not end just in a simple and usual way, but with the additional remark '*deśakālavayovasthānurūpyeṇātmagataparagatamadhyasthā uttamamadhyamādhamais strīpuṃsais svaprayogavaśā dupapādyā iti*.' This seems strange and further research will be necessary to determine its authenticity. In the K.M. edn. it is noted that some MSS. do not read this whole passage at all. No doubt there must be a closing remark regarding *vyabhicārins*. But the question arises only in regard to this additional matter. If at all this matter was written by Bharata, then one may imagine that in support of the things said in this additional sentence, he reads some *ānuvaṃśya* verses and somehow such things are missing. There would be a necessity of quoting some *ānuvaṃśya* verses only if the above mentioned matter is proved to be genuine. Otherwise there is no need of quoting any *ānuvaṃśya* verses here. For the present these things cannot be decided. Still on the basis of Bharata's general practice in dealing with these things and his plan, we are inclined to believe that neither the sentence *atra ślokaḥ* nor the verse *trayaśtriṃsādime*, etc. is reliable. In spite of this we are compelled not to reject this verse altogether, as there is no linking sentence in the prose. There is a closing sentence in prose (*eva mete trayaśtriṃsad vyabhicāriṇo bhāvāh*), but in prose there is no introductory sentence like *sāttvikā nidānīṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* or one that expresses the same, which should be there according to

usual practice, known from the expressions like *vyabhicāriṇa idanīṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* (Vol. I, p. 355). Therefore, we accept this verse as a linking factor in the immediate context but cannot accept the sentence *atra ślokaḥ* to be genuine. It means that, in our opinion, this verse is not *ānuvaṃśya* as the G.O.S. first edn. reads it. In fact, though interrupted by the verse, *trayastriṃśat* etc., the prose passage, *eva mete*, etc. is not separate from the present passage, *atrāha — ki manye bhāvās sattvena vinā'bhidhīyante* etc., which defines the *sattva*. With this idea we do not count it separately.

2. In this prose there is a sentence *eṣā midānīṃ lakṣaṇa mabhivyākhyāsyāmaḥ* which the G.O.S. and Chow. edns. read while the K.M. edn. does not. Should not the word be *nidarśana* along with the word *lakṣaṇa* ?

3. This prose is preceded by a verse which gives an account of the *varṇas* along with their names. This fashion of introducing a new subject is also seen elsewhere, for example, the six *alaṃkāras* (Vol. II, p. 392) are introduced in a verse and then they are discussed in the prose and at the end *ānuvaṃśya* verses are also given. If we take this into consideration the introduction of *varṇas* in verse does not appear as a single incidence, but this does not explain the loss of the *ānuvaṃśya* verses.

4. This prose passage is meant for discussing the six *aṅgas* of *pāṭhya*, but it is seen without *ānuvaṃśya* verses. Again Bharata takes the *virāma* which he counts as *viccheda* in six *aṅgas*, and further discusses it in prose below which there is an *ānuvaṃśya* verse (Vol. II, p. 399). Though this prose comes after the other without having been interrupted by any verse or verses, these two should be considered as separate, for the latter is not a continuation proper, but is meant to stress the importance of one of the six *aṅgas* and the former topic properly ends before the latter begins. Therefore it is better to count our present passage among those lacking the *ānuvaṃśya* verses.

5. This passage does not exist in the Chow. edn. and moreover there is in the two edns. a lot of difference in the order of reading various matters.

Class No. II—Doubtful

1. In the portion of the *N.Ś.* that falls before the sixth Ch. there is no prose passage which can be legitimately accepted, except a few stray usages seen outside the verses, such as *yathā* (Cf. in the fifth Ch.) *ṛṣaya ūcuh, Bharata uvāca* (K.M. edn. Ch. 4, p. 61) and so on. Abhinava expresses his view about the use, *ṛṣaya ūcuriti prakṣiptam* (Vol. I, p. 170). Here the word *prakṣipta* does not mean interpolated by somebody, but, according to Abhinava, it means 'kept' (*niveśita*) or 'used' by Bharata himself. From this it is obvious that Abhinava, too, thinks of such usages to be of mere clarifying nature, but not serious and significant. The G.O.S. edn. does not read Bharata *uvāca*. So far as our present passage is concerned it was printed only in first edn. and this page number referes to the same. In the Chow. edn. this passage does not exist. In the second edn. regarding this passage the editor Śāstri points out that 'obviously, it is a part of the commentery, erroneously mixed up with the text' (*see* Preface, p. 4 and also p. 217, footnote 2.). So far as the stray usages quoted above are concerned, these are not worth considering as serious prose passages and no conclusion can be drawn on their basis, even if they are at all genuine. We can, therefore, safely come to the conclusion that

there does not exist any prose passage in the chapters from first to fifth, as has been explained in the body of this text.

2. The K.M. and Chow. edns. do not read this passage at all. There does not seem any necessity for the passage seen before it in this very Ch.

3. In the Chow. edn. this passage is seen in Ch. thirty-fifth, viz., *Bhūmikā-pātravikalpa* (called *Bhumivikalpa* in K.M. edn.) but in the K.M. edn. it is seen in the twenty-fourth Ch., called there as *sāmānyābhinaya*. In fact this passage is not reliable, for, according to Bharata's plan, there is, as explained in the body of this work, no scope for this subject to exist as such in any Ch.

4. Unless he intends to hold some discussion on a subject, to be followed by an *ānuvaṃśya* verse or verses, Bharata generally does not use the prose in order to introduce a new topic. These passages, as they do not suit his usual procedure, seem to be questionable. Even if they are really written by Bharata, these need not be taken seriously, as their purpose is simply to introduce a new topic. Therefore these are not worth consideration here.

Class No. III—Having Some Traces of Ānuvamsyas

1. This prose passage is printed in the G.O.S. and Chow. edns. along with the prose concerned with the *varṇas* and which is available without *ānuvaṃśya* verses. In fact, these two prose passages do not make one as the subject matter is quite different, so these should be considered as two independent prose passages. At the end of the present passage there does not exist any *ānuvaṃśya* or a sentence *atra ślokaḥ*, etc. Still, if we consider Bharata's procedure in places like the definition of *śaṅkā* (Vol. I, pp. 357-8) where *ānuvaṃśyas* are read in the middle of the prose passage apart from those read at the end, that gives a certain scope for considering this verse seen in the middle of the *kākusvara* topic to be an *ānuvaṃśya* verse. The language of the verse also supports this view. Therefore this passage need not be taken to be lacking in the *ānuvaṃśya* verse.

2. This passage should not be considered to be a short one, on the contrary it must be taken as quite long, since the topic does not end in one or two lines. This passage is thrice interrupted by some verses, before which there are no such usages as *atra ślokāḥ*, etc. In spite of the lack of literal evidence, these verses may be taken as *ānuvaṃśyas*, for the matters said in those verses are repeated in the prose, which gives the clue when the repetition noticed in almost every place is remembered. Moreover, the language and construction of the verses, too, help us to identify it. There will be no harm if these verses are taken to be *ānuvaṃśyas* and this passage considered not to lack the *ānuvaṃśya* verses.

3. Under this prose there is a verse in the K.M. edn. which is not seen in the Chow. edn. Though there is no literal evidence here to take it as an *ānuvaṃśya*, yet it appears to be such.

INDEX

(This does not include Sanskrit quotations, footnotes and Appendix)

Other Works by the Same Author

NATYA NRTTA AND NRTYA
THEIR MEANING AND RELATION

★

THE INDIAN TECHNIQUE
OF
CLAY MODELLING

★

TECHNIQUE OF GANDHARAN AND INDO-AFGHAN
STUCCO IMAGES

(To be published soon)